

The Rambler,

A CATHOLIC JOURNAL AND REVIEW.

VOL. VIII.

OCTOBER 1851.

PART XLVI.

STATE ENCROACHMENTS ON THE CHURCH BEFORE THE REFORMATION.

IN considering the era of the Reformation, the period between the reigns of Henry III. and Henry VIII., it is of the utmost importance to recapitulate the result of our review of the period which preceded that era.

We have seen that originally, as the office and function of a pastor, whether a priest or bishop, were purely spiritual, so the conferring of the pastoral office, priestly or episcopal, was considered likewise of purely spiritual cognizance. And so much was this considered, that even after bishoprics and parishes were endowed, and the Church was "established," for some centuries the Crown was conceived to have no concern whatever with appointments to the episcopate or the priesthood, nor any concern whatever with the exercise of the episcopal or priestly functions. The parties, whether monarchs or private individuals, who endowed the "churches," episcopal or parochial, drove no bargain with the Church, did not consider that they thereby *purchased* any thing, did not seek to acquire a control over the spiritual as an equivalent for their donations of the temporal; in other words, did not, as the price of their endowments of parishes, require the right of "presentation" to them, and thus turn a "cure" of souls into a "living," and make it a matter of barter. But on this very account, we have seen, in the purer and primitive age of the Anglican Church, *because* the princes and the people were such good children of the Church that they did not desire to *buy* a right of intermeddling in her spiritual governance, but deemed it an honour and a privilege to lay their worldly possessions at her feet, and considered the appointment to the episcopate or parochial pastorship a purely spiritual matter; and because they partook in a great measure of the spirit of

primitive piety,—the Church placed confidence in them, and a custom arose of consulting the pious laity, whether of kingly or of noble rank, as to the appointments to vacant bishoprics or cures. In process of time, however, we have seen, even in the Anglo-Saxon age, the spirit of worldliness rose in the Church, and men, both clerical and lay, began to think more of the *temporalities* of a bishopric or a cure than of the *spiritualities*; and instead of considering the latter as the principal, and the former merely as the accidents and accessories, looked upon the appointment to the bishopric or cure more as the means of becoming possessed of the temporal goods belonging to it; and to speak, therefore, of the *temporalities* of the see instead of the episcopate as the “bishopric,” and to call a cure of souls a “benefice;” and as a natural consequence of this evil in the Church, counteracted as it was in the Anglo-Saxon age by the saintliness of so many of its sovereigns, but aggravated as it was under the Norman dynasty by the utter worldliness and wickedness of the monarchs who reigned, we find bishoprics and benefices avowedly conferred, under the pretence of “nomination” or “presentation,” by the Crown or the lay patron. It will have been observed, however, that this system, as it had probably originally arisen, so existed, or at least succeeded to a greater extent, in the cases of *benefices* or *bishoprics* than of *archbishoprics*; the reason being, that whereas the former were, except in cases of appeal, settled in this country by the confirmation or induction of the archbishop or bishop, in the case of an archbishop the Papal confirmation and the conferring of the pall was requisite to confer full archiepiscopal authority. And the effect of this was, of course, to bring archiepiscopal elections more promptly and regularly under the consideration and control of the Pontiff, the Supreme Pastor of the Church; and the consequence was, as we have seen, that in such cases it was that most frequently, and indeed constantly, occurred collisions between the Holy See and the Crown, and disallowance of archiepiscopal elections as uncanonical or corrupt. Indirectly, of course, the occurrence of these contests in cases of archbishops kept constantly before the courts and the national Church the authority of the Holy See, as an appeal in all similar cases of corrupt or uncanonical elections or inductions in regard to bishoprics or benefices. And it can easily be conceived that all this was exceedingly inconvenient and annoying to the Crown and the corrupt portion of the clergy and laity, being a continual check on their sordid patronagemongering. Nevertheless, the Pontifical authority was too clear ever to be denied, however its exercise in particular

cases might be disputed or obstructed. It may have been observed, however, that the mode in which the Holy See had hitherto exercised its control over archiepiscopal or episcopal elections was about as inconvenient to the Church as the existence of the authority was to the Crown, inasmuch as it necessarily entailed an interval often of one, two, or three years, during which the see was kept vacant, while one or more corrupt and uncanonical elections were being set aside; and (as we have seen) the Pontiff sometimes had, in order to prevent longer delay, to terminate the dispute *by himself appointing to the vacant see*;—an exercise of supreme pastoral power which, however often exclaimed against, was never denied or defied, but in every instance implicitly admitted, the prelate so appointed always being revered and recognised as such. This tended to stifle that sordid spirit which had begun to eat into the core of the English Church, and led too many of her laity and clergy to regard the appointment to sees and cures of souls chiefly or exclusively as a *legal* right to their *temporal* possessions, by acting upon the principle that the matter was one of purely *pastoral* authority. But the Pope at last found that the only way of completely overcoming the local system of corruption which bought and sold bishoprics and benefices, and under the pretence of *patronage* drove a dirty barter in the cure of souls, was to *anticipate the exercise* of this “patronage,” and so stifle the system in its rise, by exercising his paramount pastoral power, not only so far as absolutely to appoint to bishoprics or parishes himself when *vacant*, but to make appointments by way of “provision” for vacancies. We have seen that the Papal appointments were as usually *good* as those of the Crown or lay patrons were usually or generally bad; and it is obvious that what the Supreme Pastor might do when he pleased, he might as well *do at once*, and *prevent* the evil rather than remedy it. But we have seen that a jealousy had arisen on the part of the laity and clergy of the English Church as to the exercise of this power, purely on account of its tending to confer temporalities on foreigners, or at all events to supersede local “rights” of patronage, and the sordid jobbing which had become *incident* to it. Thus, then, a spirit of resistance to the Holy See in this matter had arisen, solely from the sordid spirit of worldliness and the foul love of money, for those who complained did not (as we have seen) at all pretend that the Pope’s appointments were not *good*; and (as we have also seen) the local ones were often *bad*, and the complainants themselves put their objections upon merely mean and *money* grounds. Such was the state of things at the end of the reign

of Henry III., and such an abuse we see still more plainly and painfully in the reigns of his successors, precisely the same spirit actuating all of them, and the successive parliaments under them, up to the fatal consummation of all in the reign of Henry VIII.

At the end of the reign of Henry III. we first find (as we have shewn) a spirit of resistance to the right of the Pope to appoint absolutely to any bishopric or benefice; and we have seen that this arose simply on account of the bishoprics and benefices having come to be considered chiefly or solely as temporal, and not as spiritual; whereas the constant exercise of this supreme pastoral power of the Pope inconveniently interfered with this theory, and proceeded upon the contrary idea that they were purely spiritual. The whole question depended upon this: Which was the principal and the paramount, the spiritual or the temporal? Was the spiritual, by having temporalities belonging to it, made temporal or *quasi* temporal; and must it, therefore, be subservient and subordinate to the temporal? In short, must the cure of souls be considered the chief thing, or its *endowment*? The Crown had long said the latter, and now the people, clergy, and laity began to say so too. But the common law* and common sense said the contrary; for the cure of souls was prior and was principal; the endowment was subsequent and accessory, and so should be subservient; and if the original donors of the endowment did not (as we have seen) stipulate for any right of control over the spiritual, or of nomination or presentation to the cure of souls, what right had their successors to claim what their ancestors had never stipulated for? And that they had *never* so stipulated, nor supposed they had *purchased* rights of patronage or presentation, is clear from what we have seen in history, and from many things we can shew in law. Thus, as we have mentioned, the *Mirror of Justice*, the oldest book of our common law, says not a word of any such rights and patronage either in the Crown or any private parties. And in the reign of Edward III. a curious case occurs, in which one of the judges says (speaking of a transaction which took place under the Conqueror), "*it is not long since a man knew not what an advowson was,*" *i. e.* a legal right of presentation. Clearly, then, any such claim was unknown *before* the Conquest, and was *recent* some considerable time *after* it. Another fact we have already stated (especially as to the charters) seems to shew conclusively that the claim was an usurpation of the Norman monarchs, arising from their

* As laid down by Bracton in this very reign. See the citations in the *Catholic Hierarchy considered*.

enormous rapacity. Lastly, that great sage of the law, Bracton, writing in this very reign of Henry III., speaks of this claim of patronage as purely temporal, and as only pertaining to the temporal, and as accessory and secondary to the spiritual, which, he lays down distinctly, it must not interfere with or contest, but must have full freedom, according to the law of the Church; so that though the Crown had power to withhold the temporalities, the Pope had sovereign power to confer the spiritualities, *i. e.* the pastoral jurisdiction, parochial or episcopal.

Such having been the state of things and such the state of the law at the end of the reign of Henry III., we proceed to the very eventful reign of Edward I. We have explained that in order to counteract the sordid system of corruption under which, as we have seen, a shameful traffic was sure almost to take place upon the vacation of a bishopric or benefice between the clergy and the Crown, or other lay patrons, the Holy Father had found it necessary sometimes to *appoint himself* absolutely upon vacancies, and *provisionally* for *future* vacancies; *i. e.* in the latter case the Pope appointed persons to sees or cures of souls before they were vacant, by anticipation or provision, and in order to preclude the possibility of a corrupt exercise of the "right" of patronage, which, be it carefully observed, was *no right* at all, but simply an *usurpation*. The Pope's mode of *evading* the usurpation, and superseding the sordid system it was made subservient to, of course caused jealousy and discontent; and an outcry at last arose against it, which, as we have already hinted, was equally popular and plausible, for it was at once *natural* and *national*: it was *natural* that the English clergy, who, if local patrons could exercise their right or claim, would secure benefices or bishoprics, should complain of losing them; and it was *national* that the Crown and other lay patrons, who on this subject had a perfect sympathy, should object to temporal property being virtually given away *by* foreigners, and often *to* foreigners. But though the feeling was *natural* and *national*, it was neither logical nor legal; for the temporal possessions were the *accident* and *accessory* to the cure of souls, and must necessarily follow and attend the principal; and (as already stated) the law considered that the *temporal followed the spiritual*, and that over the spiritual the Pope was supreme. Selfishness, however, cares not for logic, and will *warp* law if it can; and the Crown and people of England soon *warped* the law to their own purpose, and made a law of their own to cripple and restrain the Papal power of presentation, and *really* to resist the spiritual authority, while professedly only resisting the *temporal results* of its exercise.

For, let it be remarked that the Pope never claimed to confer the temporalities. All *he* ever claimed to appoint to was the pastorship, episcopal or parochial; the Crown or lay patrons *presented* the temporal possessions attached thereto, and the law of England compelled them to present them to those who were so appointed by the Pope to the pastorship, deeming the temporal *incident* to the spiritual, and the Pope *supreme over the spiritual*. And *being* supreme, the law has hitherto heard or known nothing about restraining the exercise of this power by restricting it to sees or cures already vacant or otherwise. Such a restraint could scarcely be logical, rational, or consistent; because, as the Pope had power to remove a bishop or priest by virtue of his sovereign supremacy, and then appoint some one in his stead, it could hardly be objected to that he should provide for a vacancy when it should occur, and which he could create when he chose. Moreover, it is worth while to observe, that the first provision was by St. Peter; who, as Rufinus states, when he ordained St. Clement to the see of Rome, ordained Linus, or Editus, as his successor, to provide “against a vacancy.” And it may be added, that (as in our first article we shewed) in the earliest ages of the Anglo-Saxon Church, the Pope in appointing to the archiepiscopal sees also made provision as to a successor. So clear is it that the Pope had a right to make these provisions, and that they did not at all interfere with any right of the Crown, that we find from Lingard that the Crown itself resorted to them; and so well was it understood that they did not touch any temporal rights, that we read in Rymer that it was customary for the Pope to send a copy of the provision to the king, with a request that he would *grant* the *temporalities* of the see to the new bishop. If the king did not choose to do so, the new prelate of course had no remedy, but was not the less recognised as *bishop* by the law of the land as well as by the law of the Church. It is impossible to prove more plainly that, by both the one law and the other, these provisions were justified and sanctioned. In short, they were a settled and constant custom before the close of the reign of Henry III.,* clearly recognised by the law; insomuch that when a knight who had, “by papal provision, been deprived of his nomination to a *living* in the gift of his family,”† raised a conspiracy against the custom, seizing the persons and goods of the foreign ecclesiastics who were benefited by it, although in *secret*

* Indeed, so little difference was seen in principle between an absolute and provisional appointment, that it should seem sometimes the phrase ‘provision’ is applied to *any* appointment by the Pope.

† We are pained to say that this is the language of Lingard: a “*living*!”

some chief persons in the realm abetted the opposition, they durst not openly avow it, and the law repressed it; and the restoration of provisions was repeatedly matter of negotiation.

At the same time, it must be mentioned that the jealousy of the English clergy led prelates of considerable distinction to oppose themselves to Papal provisions, without whose opposition probably the Crown and the laity would never have dared to resist them; and it is at once instructive and melancholy to remark, that a bishop so eminent as Grosteste should have openly opposed himself on this point to the Papal supremacy; and that while, with an inconsistency which is observed by Dr. Lingard, he "professed a most profound veneration for the successors of St. Peter, and entertained most exalted ideas of their prerogatives," yet he "would often *dispute the exercise of their authority*, and neither Pope nor legate could prevail upon him to give institution to *foreign* clergymen presented to benefices in his diocese." This is the language of Lingard, and it discloses no shadow of excuse for the prelate, who does not dare, it appears, to deny the Papal *right*, nor to put his opposition to its exercise on the ground that *improper persons* were presented, but solely that *foreigners* were presented. From the manner, however, in which the historian narrates in the very next passage an instance in which the celebrated Bishop of Lincoln resisted a Papal provision, one is encouraged to entertain a charitable hope that his opposition was rather of the character of remonstrance as to the particular exercise of the right, than of unqualified resistance to it on the *wretched* ground put forward—apparently with no scruple as to its sufficiency—by the modern Catholic historian of England. "When the nuncio sent him a provision by which the nephew of Innocent IV. was promoted to a prebend in the church of Lincoln, Grosteste replied, in language *singularly energetic*, 'that *the provision*' (*i. e.* as it should seem, *this particular provision*) 'was contrary to the good of the Church; that he would not consider it as emanating from the Pontiff' (*i. e.* implying, as it may be presumed, that he rather supposed it an *oversight*, and that if it really *did* emanate from the Pontiff, he would be bound to obey it), 'and that he should never deem it his duty to carry it into execution.'" That the real reason for the bishop's resistance, at least in this case, and probably in others, was not any inclination to defy or deny the right, but simply to remonstrate as to its *exercise*, we may the more believe (notwithstanding the evident inclination of the historian to make the contrary appear) from the fact, that the Pope was not at all indignant, but wrote an answer *proposing remedies for any abuses in the practice* of provisions.

That abuses sometimes did occur, it were of course not worth while to dispute, though our readers will observe that the Pope was the proper authority to remedy them, and never refused to exert himself for that end; and they will, we think, have been convinced from our previous statements that abuses far more frequently occurred on kingly appointments than papal provisions, which were rather the remedies than the means of abuse. Our ideas on the subject are confirmed by finding that when Grosteste presented to the Pope a memorial on the abuses of the Church, and mentioned first the evil of bad pastors, and complained that the Holy See could remedy this evil, although he added a complaint of provisions, it would rather appear from the context that he meant *such provisions as imposed bad pastors on the Church*, and did not intend to object to the exercise of the right of Papal presentment, or otherwise it would be obviously inconsistent in him to complain of the Holy See for not exercising its power to prevent the intrusion of bad pastors, that is, by *appointing good ones*.

In the reign of Edward I. we find ample confirmation of these views. In the first year of his reign (A.D. 1276), the Pope appointed Robert de Kelwordly to the see of Canterbury. The king's council (the monarch being on his way from the Holy Land) admitted the new primate with a protestation (we quote Lingard), "that the provision* was contrary to the rights of the Crown" (mark the sole consequence), "and that the king would not for the future hold himself obliged to grant the *temporalities* to prelates so provided." Here it is evident the very statesmen who were disposed to dispute papal provisions did so at least *directly* only as to the *temporalities*, and dared not deny that the prelate "provided" was *bishop*. Some years later we read, "the archbishop resigned on being appointed cardinal; and the Pope appointed his successor, but omitted in his letter to the king the usual request concerning temporalities. The omission created an objection; but on the supposition that it had been an error of the clerk, was at length overlooked." In Wharton's *Anglia Sacra* we find it stated that in the same reign (1282) a Bishop of Winchester, after being *admitted by the king*, was set aside by the Pope, who conferred the see on another, and consecrated him at Rome. So, at the close of the same reign (1305), we find that the Pope, without consulting king or chapter, created William de Geysnbord Bishop of Winchester, and, probably by an oversight, professed in the bull to confer on him the *temporalities* as well as the *spiritualities*; on which

* Lingard has not stated that appointment was properly by way of provision, *i. e.* before the death of the predecessor.

the king withheld the temporalities until the bishop renounced that clause in the bull, and confessed that he held the temporalities of the Crown; which renunciation and declaration were from that time exacted from every prelate presented by papal provision; and the *very exaction implied that thereby all legal objection to papal provisions was removed, and they were, in fact, regularly recognised at law.*

With these preliminary remarks, our readers will be able to appreciate a remarkable but obscure case, of which we have no contemporary record, and only catch a glimpse through so suspicious a medium of information as Lord Coke, but which very probably occurred in some way substantially as he states it, and which contains in itself in solution the whole principle afterwards expounded in the successive statutes of "*præmunire*" and "*provisors*," and consummated in the Reformation. Short as it is, it is pregnant with fatal import and pernicious results.

"The king (Edward I.) presented his clerk to a benefice, who was refused by the Archbishop, for that the Pope, by way of 'provision,' had conferred it on another. The king brought *quare impedit*.* The Archbishop pleaded that the Bishop of Rome† had long time before *provided* to the said church, as *having supreme authority*, and that he could not put him out who was by the Pope's bull in possession; for which, by judgment of the common law, the lands of his whole bishopric were seized into the king's hands during his life." Thus Lord Coke tells the story, asserting that it was a regular legal judgment at common law by which the Archbishop's lands were seized. But there is (as we have seen) no trace of any law by which such a judgment could be given; and most likely the "judgment" was only the arbitrary act of the enraged monarch, quite in accordance with numerous precedents of his predecessors, some of which we have mentioned, and in which they were accustomed to lay violent hands on the property of any prelate who offended them, glad of a pretext for so doing. To give the devil his due, and to do these Norman sovereigns justice, indeed they did not at all try to encroach on the spiritual, simply because they did not care at all about it; all they coveted was the temporal; and if they fettered or crippled the spiritual, it was only indirectly and unintentionally, and in order to enable themselves to *get at* the temporal. Thus we never read that they tried to prevent the exercise by prelates they quarrelled with of their episcopal functions, except it was when, by excommunication,

* A suit to compel the admission of the king's nominee.

† The phrase is Lord Coke's.

they were indirectly affected temporally, but they seemed quite satisfied when they could "seize the *temporalities*." It must be mentioned, moreover, that (in the language of Lingard) our monarchs were not sincere in their hostility to a practice of which they themselves were eager to take advantage. They *solicited provisions themselves*. Scarcely a year elapsed in which they did not obtain several grants of this description *in favour of their own chaplains*. In 1305, Edward obtained no less than *six*. It was only when the Papal provisions interfered with their own plans that they objected, and only *pretended* them to be illegal. That this impudent "judgment" was illegal is palpable. It was a flagrant violation of the Great Charter, and repeatedly confessed by the Crown to be contrary to law, to take the *whole* of a man's property, or to inflict any extravagant or excessive fine, for a mere misdemeanour or contempt. And the Archbishop's conduct, even if as illegal as it was clearly *legal*, amounted at the utmost to no more than a contempt, for which, according to the charters and the common law, a *reasonable* fine should have been imposed. And especially is this case monstrous when it is observed that the property seized was not the Archbishop's, except in right of his Church, and was *Church* property, which could not rationally or legally be seized for a contempt of the Archbishop. It is important to remark all this at the outset, because the statutes of *præmunire* and *provisors* really only enact this case and its principle into law, and *profess* to re-enact the common law of England; whereas the case was *not* law, but contrary to law, and the common law was not re-enacted, but violated and outraged. That the Crown was constantly outraging and encroaching upon the Church this very king confesses in the "statute of Westminster 1," where he says that "*the state (estate) of holy Church hath been evil kept, and the prelates and religious persons grieved many ways;*" and how "grieved" we have just seen. Indeed nothing can be more curious than the callousness with which these arbitrary kings oppressed the Church, and the carelessness with which they *confessed* it. And once for all, to convince every one out of the mouth of the Crown itself that such cases as that cited by Lord Coke were contrary to law, let us cite one of these confessions from a statute of no less a monarch than Edward III.,—the very king in whose reign the statutes of *præmunire* and *provisors* passed, and who, like Edward I., was a proud, powerful, and despotic prince. He and his Parliament say (19 Edw. III.), "that whereas the *temporalities of Archbishops and Bishops have been oftentimes taken into the king's hands for contempts*

done to him, the justices who shall henceforth give judgment against any prelate in such case or the like shall *receive a reasonable fine.*" And again, to shew how usual similar encroachments were, but at the same time how they were *known and confessed to be* encroachments, let us cite one or two more confessions. It is stated in a statute 9 Edward II. that "the king's letters have been directed to ordinaries that (who) have *wrapped* those that be in subjection unto them in the sentence of excommunication, that they should assoil (absolve) them by a certain day, or appear and shew cause," &c.: "*no such letter shall henceforth be suffered to go forth,*" &c. And again, it is cited in 15 Edw. III., "that commissions have been recently made to justices that they shall make inquiries as to whether the judges of holy Church make just process *in causes which notoriously pertain to the cognisance of holy Church*: such commissions shall be repealed." Not to weary our readers with citations, it may suffice to say once for all, that they are usual and common all through succeeding reigns, and significantly shew a *constant system of encroachment on the part of the Crown against the Church*. Those, therefore, who, after the example of Lord Coke (men like Mr. Irons for instance), content themselves with collecting and citing all the most monstrous cases of outrage upon the Church, as if they were legal and justifiable, instead of being illegal, tyrannical, and unjustifiable, evince either inconceivable ignorance or enormous dissimulation.

What kind of a king Edward I. was,—how worthy a successor of Henry II. and precursor of Henry VIII.,—may be gathered from the following extract out of Lingard:

"Under the pretence of a crusade, he obtained from Pope Nicholas IV. the tenth of all ecclesiastical benefices for the next six years. In 1294 he had recourse to a bold but despotic expedient. Commissioners were appointed to search the treasuries of every church and monastery; the monies deposited in them, whether they were the property of monastic and clerical bodies, or had been placed there for greater security by private individuals, were entered on the rolls of the Exchequer, and the principal sums, under the denomination of *loans*, were carried away for the use of the king. A few months later, he required from the clergy half their income, both from their lay fees and benefices. At this unprecedented demand they were filled with astonishment, and a vigorous opposition was commenced; but the Archbishop of Canterbury had previously left the kingdom. The Dean of St. Paul's, whom they sent to expostulate with the king, expired in his

presence; and Sir John Havering, unexpectedly entering the hall, addressed them thus: 'Reverend Fathers,—If there be any among you who dares to contradict the royal will, let him stand forth, that his person may be known and noticed as one who has broken the king's peace.' At this threat they submitted; and the success of the experiment induced him to repeat it in the following year. From the clergy he then demanded a third. They offered a tenth; which was, after a scornful refusal, accepted. They had now recourse to the Papal authority to shield them from royal extortion; and Boniface VIII. published a bull forbidding the clergy of any Christian country from granting to laymen the revenues of their *benefices* without the permission of the Holy See. Upon this plea, in the next year, they resisted the king's demand of a fifth. The Archbishop addressed the commissioners thus: 'You know that, under God, we have two lords—the one spiritual, the other temporal. Obedience is due to both; but *more to the spiritual*. We are willing to do every thing in our power, and will send deputies at our expense to consult the Pontiff.' Edward then *issued a proclamation of outlawry against the clergy, regular and secular, and took possession of all their lay fees, goods, and chattels, for the benefit of the Crown*. Before the king's writs were issued, however, the Archbishop of York with his clergy had *compounded* by the grant of a fifth, to avert the royal displeasure" (disregarding the *Papal* prohibition). "In the province of Canterbury the officials of the Crown took possession of all clerical property, real and personal; and intimation was made to the owners, that whatever was not redeemed before Easter would be irrecoverably forfeited. The Convocation assembled on Mid-Lent Sunday. As long as they remained together, their constancy was invincible; they adhered to their former resolution, and determined to suffer with patience every privation; but the moment Convocation was dissolved, a few eagerly sought the royal favour. Their example was quickly followed; some deposited sums of money in places where they might be seized by the officers of the Exchequer, and others purchased at arbitrary prices letters of protection. Still there remained many who refused to descend to such expedients; and the Archbishop, a man of inflexible resolution, retired with a single chaplain to a parsonage in the country, where he discharged the functions of a curate, and subsisted on the alms of the parishioners. Of his suffragans, the Bishop of Lincoln alone imitated his example; but the friends of that prelate subscribed the sum required by the king, and obtained the restoration of his temporalities. Had Edward confined his

rapacity to the *clergy*, he might have continued to despise their remonstrances; but the aids he annually raised on the *freeholders*, the tallages he so frequently demanded of the *cities and boroughs*, and the additional duties he extorted from the *merchants*, excited a general spirit of discontent, and preparations were made for resistance. Bigod, Earl of Norfolk, Marshal of England, refused the command of his army abroad. Edward in a paroxysm of rage exclaimed, 'By the everlasting God, Sir Earl, you shall go or hang!' 'By the everlasting God, Sir King,' replied Bigod, 'I will neither go nor hang!' and he departed, followed by fifteen hundred knights. The royal officers, intimidated, ceased to levy the purveyance. Edward saw it was necessary to dissemble; *received the Primate with kindness, and ordered the restoration of his lands.* A few years after, Edward charged the Primate with having entered into a treasonable conspiracy. The Pontiff suspended him provisionally, and summoned him to plead his cause in the Papal court. He remained two years there, but returned with honour; and the historians praise him for his resistance to the king's exactions, and his courage in protesting against the oppressions of the people."

What can be more absurd than to represent the arbitrary acts of such a king as *law*? or the concurrence of the laity as anything better than a selfish connivance at the plunder of the clergy, in order to avert the royal rapacity from themselves?—a concurrence which lasted just as long as it suited the convenience of the laity, who, when the shoe pinched *them*, began to resist, but who would have acquiesced in the robbery of the clergy as long as the king pleased. The people in those times knew better. They were well aware that such things were *not law*; and they proceeded *to make them law*. If the "case" stated by Lord Coke were clear *law*, there could have been no occasion for the celebrated statute of *provisors*, 25 Edward III. (1352), which recites that "the Church of England was *founded* (*i. e.* according to the old meaning of the word, and as the context itself clearly shews, *endowed*) by the king and his progenitors, and the nobles of the realm and their ancestors, to inform them and the people of the law of God, and to make hospitalities and alms and other works of charity in the places where the churches were founded (*i. e.* *endowed*); and certain *possessions* of lands, &c. were *assigned by the said founders* to the prelates and people of holy Church, to sustain the said charge." Such is the legislative *preface* or statement of facts: what inference is deduced from it? "And the king and nobles have, and ought to have had, the custody of voidances and *presentments and collations of benefices of such pre-*

lacies." That is, in other words, that because the ancestors of "the king and his nobles" had endowed the Church with part of their lands, "the king and his nobles" had a right, as a legal return or equivalent for such endowment, to present prelates to the bishoprics, or priests to the benefices. It is sufficient to shew the impudence of this claim to say (as we have already remarked), that the "ancestors of the king and his nobles" never set it up, and never pretended to have *purchased* such a legal right of patronage or presentment, or to have made their gifts to God and his Church the *price* of a valuable return; and if those who gave the lands never purchased such a right, how could their successors pretend to it, especially as the "right" claimed was a right over the very lands which had been *given away*? And the statute, with the strange stupidity of dishonesty, actually recites that the ancestors of the king and his nobles had *given away* the lands to the Church, and yet asserts a right in the successors over those very lands, which were the absolute property of the Church, held by a tenure known to the law, and with which lay lords had no concern whatever.*

The statute, however, absurdly assuming that the heirs of those who had given land away retained a right of control over it, proceeded to recite as the grievance complained of, that "the Pope doth give the said *possessions* and *benefices* as if he were patron thereof," &c. Nothing is said as to the sees or cures of souls; the sordid laity cared not for that; all their anxiety was as to the *possessions*; and the *gist* of the complaint is at the end: "And doth give the same to *aliens* who never dwell in England, and cardinals who cannot dwell there; and thereby *great treasure is carried away*." Some of our Protestant friends have, amusingly enough, laid hold of this passage to prove the dislike our Catholic ancestors felt to cardinals, ignorant that the statute-book shews several instances of exemption made *in favour* of cardinals, *provided they would "dwell here,"* our ancestors having had the sense to see it was a great *honour* to have a cardinal resident in the country, their only objection being to cardinals *non-resident*.† In truth, however, the real reason of the statute was not this of non-residence, but that which is so pathetically and expressively added, "last not least," that "*thereby great treasure is carried away*." "Ay, there's the rub!" These words are the more remarkable because repeated in almost every

* See Littleton as to tenure and frankalmoigne, cited in the *Catholic Hierarchy vindicated*, &c.

† See Thomson's *Magna Charta*, and the recitals of all the great charters, in which a cardinal is sure to figure.

subsequent statute on the same subject down to those of Henry VIII. We have sufficiently shewn how prone the king and his nobles were to use their patronage for the purpose of putting money in their pockets, and we can conceive their repugnance to treasure being carried away from them. The object of the act is simply to secure to them the legal power of exercising their patronage, and of presenting one of their dependents, or perhaps even *purchasers*, to the vacant bishopric or benefice. The infamy of the proposition it is elaborately attempted to disguise by flimsy pretences of hypocrisy about non-residence, &c.; but no Catholic really need be reminded that even if evils occasionally arose (as by reason of non-residence) from any particular exercise of a prerogative in the Holy See, such abuse formed no excuse for resistance to that prerogative. And more especially is this obviously only a pretence of hypocrisy in the present case, because the Popes repeatedly made "constitutions" to prevent pluralities or non-residence, and the records of the English courts of law at this very time disclose that these constitutions were constantly put in execution. Moreover, our readers will not require to be reminded of what they have remarked all along with respect to the opposition to papal provisions, that the real reason why they were objected to was, not that the persons presented were *non-resident* (of which we read nothing in the previous agitations against the practice, and of which we can easily see the instances must have been rare, as the remedy was easy), but that they were *foreigners*. And let us repeat what it is all-important to remark, that no complaint is, even down to this very statute itself, made as to the "provisors" being persons improper or incompetent for their cures or sees (exceptional cases apart); and on the contrary, the most flagrant corruptions commonly occurring in kingly presentations, while on the other hand the papal presentments were as commonly good, and some of our most saintly prelates were "aliens," although "aliens" who *did* "dwell here." After such hypocritical reasons in the reciting part, the statute proceeds in the "enacting part" (as the lawyers call it) to ordain "that *free elections* of archbishops, bishops, and other dignities and benefices elective, shall *hold* henceforth, as *granted* by the king's progenitors and the ancestors of other lords, founders of the said dignities and other benefices." The sense in which the "king's progenitors and the ancestors of other lords" had "granted free elections," was just the same as the sense in which they had "founded" the said "dignities and benefices;" that is, they had *given lands*, &c. to the dignities, or benefices, to be holden by the persons "freely elect-

ed" or canonically appointed thereto. The sense in which the Crown and Parliament now used the phrase "free elections" was, as our readers will probably suspect, a somewhat different sense; seeing that if it were the *same*, no statute would be more senseless, since the law already secured the temporalities to the persons "freely elected" or canonically appointed to the said "benefices or dignities." It is sufficiently clear that the "free elections" for which the "king and his nobles" professed such an extreme but somewhat insincere anxiety, were elections free from any such controlling power of the Pope as had been found to check the corruptions of "patronage;" and so the statute proceeds to enact, "that all the people of holy Church" (*i. e.* especially the "king and his nobles") "who have advowsons of any benefices" (*i. e.* usurped right of patronage) "shall have their collations and presentments free," *i. e.* exercise their "patronage" as corruptly as they please, "free" from any control of the Supreme Pastor of the Church, and "that in case that *reservation, collation, or provision*" (*general words*) "be made by the Court of Rome of any archbishopric, bishopric, or benefice, in disturbance of the free elections, collations, or presentations aforesaid"—what then? why—"that *our lord the king* shall have the collations to the said archbishoprics and bishoprics or benefices" which be—(our lord the king, who with his nobles, had all along been the chief cause of the "disturbance of free elections," by the pernicious corruption incident to the usurped "patronage")—"which be of his own advowing, as his progenitors had before free election was granted." His "progenitors" who never had the bishoprics "in their advowing" at all, and never knew what "advowsons" meant, and never pretended to this corrupted right of "patronage," and never "granted" "free election," but only gave their property to those who should be freely elected. Truly Mr. Walpole was right in calling this statute "extraordinary and memorable." It was melancholy as well as "memorable," an "extraordinary instance," or rather an ordinary and extremely *natural* instance, of the way in which men's *interests* will warp their consciences, and impel them to the utmost to maintain a system whence they derive an illicit advantage.

That this "memorable" statute, so far from being in accordance, as Lord Coke, with his characteristic audacity on this subject, affirms, was in contravention and violation of it, is clear from this alone, that cases constantly occur in which it is set at naught in the courts of law, and in which, despite its enactments, papal "provisions" and appointments are recognised at *law*. Thus 41 Edw. III., though pertaining *pro-*

fessedly only to the temporalities, was designed to *defeat*, and not to *affirm*, the common law; for that (as laid down by Bracton) recognised the Pope as having supreme power to appoint to bishoprics or benefices, *i. e.* the sees or cures of souls; and also recognised the principle that the temporal *followed* the spiritual, and that thus the papal presentees acquired a right to the temporalities attached to those sees or cures, as well by the law of the land as by the law of the Church. The effect of this statute was to *change* this, and to declare that by *law* the papal presentee or "provisor" had no right to the see or cure, that is to say, no right to the temporalities attached thereto, which was all the law claimed cognisance of, at all events *then*. This, however, was the commencement of an evil course of resisting and restraining the free exercise of the papal supremacy; and the effect of this celebrated statute, to sum it up plainly and shortly, was simply this, to say to the Pope: We admit your supremacy as our holy Father, and your right to appoint to all our sees or cures; but we care so much more for the temporalities attached thereto than for the spiritualities, that if you choose to *exert* your right, and give the *latter* to *other* persons, when we wish to prefer our friends or dependents (which we cannot prevent you from doing), we will deprive them of the *former*."

We call this the first formal legislative deflection towards the fatal consummation of the Reformation. How rapidly the process of divergence progressed will be seen from the simple fact, that only *two* years after the passing of this act, the first of a series of statutes of *præmunire*, as they were called, was enacted, the chief scope of which was to prevent people from resorting to the See of Rome to enforce the papal provisions. The sole weapon of the Church of course was, as it always has been, the force of spiritual censure, and chiefly *excommunication*. It is instructive to observe the inevitable *progression* of wrong-doing, and the insidious nature of the encroachments of the Crown. Originally the only objection was (as we have seen) as to the *temporalities*; and the Pope's right as to the *spiritualities* of sees or cures of souls, that is, his right to appoint the *pastor*, was not at all interfered with. Practically, however, it was found impossible to have two incumbents; one claiming the temporalities under the king, or other lay patron; the other the spiritualities under the Pope, the "sovereign patron," as the *law* called him, or (as the Church called him) rather, the Supreme Pastor of holy Church: and the bishop would, of course, in the case of an incumbent, or the archbishop in the case of a bishop, be bound to induct or confirm only *one*, and to excommunicate

the other; so that the two jurisdictions, temporal and spiritual, must clash. And Parliament indirectly decided that the spiritual should be superseded, and the temporal be supreme, for the statutes of *præmunire* rendered final the pronouncing or execution. Nearly twenty years after the statute passed, we find it *pleaded against the Crown* that “our holy Father the Pope reserved to himself the bishopric, and gave it to a dependant; and that afterwards the king reciting by his patent that the Pope had presented to the dependant the bishopric, granted to him the temporalities,” and the Crown counsel do not in the least object to the plea; but on the contrary confirm it by arguing “that after the party was presented, he had to be confirmed by the Pope, and the Pope might refuse him.” And one of the judges says, “when the Pope has given the benefice (*i. e.* see) to a bishop, he has time to accept or not.” And another says, “when he is confirmed by the Pope, and his temporalities are delivered to him by the king, he has all that a bishop should have; he has both the spiritualities and the temporalities.” This and similar cases, decided *after* the statute of provisors,* clearly shew that it removed any subject of any spiritual sentence or censure of the Pope or any English prelate, in enforcement of a papal provision against the nomination of the Crown or any lay patron; or in opposition to any sentence of the king’s courts, or what *they* might choose to consider secular causes, of which *they*, the lay courts, were thus constituted sole judges. And here it will be observed that the Crown and the state were committed, legislatively, to a claim of control over that purely spiritual power of the Church, the sentence of excommunication, which, as we have seen, was under the Anglo-Saxon kings, and by the Anglo-Saxon laws, considered exclusively under the control of the Church; as exempt from all state control, and so entitled to state enforcement; which under the Conqueror it had only been attempted to clog with a claim of *notice*, and under Henry II. with a condition of *consent* where the Crown was concerned; but which now, for the first time, wherever it interfered with what the lay courts or the Crown chose to consider secular, was pronounced by Parliament unlawful, and rendered penal.

Our readers will perceive what a progress the encroachments of the Crown had made in a few generations (however indirectly and insidiously) on the *spiritual* province and power of the Church. Now, it is of course of no consequence as to the fact or extent of these encroachments, however much it may serve to shew their character, to remark, that they were all con-

* See the *Catholic Hierarchy vindicated*.

ducted *professedly* upon the principle of respecting the *spiritual* prerogative of the Church, and preserving the temporal prerogative of the Crown; because as the Crown was constituted judge of what was temporal, it was virtually, although indirectly, made, in an *executive* sense, and as to the *exercise* of the spiritual power of the Church, at least in a particular class of cases, supreme. In short, the Crown could not get at the property of the Church, and parcel it out among courtiers or courtier-like clergy, except by fettering the spiritual power of the Church, so far as it interfered with the sordid system of *patronage* and traffic in bishoprics and benefices, which we have shewn the Crown and a corrupt laity and clergy had long carried on. The Pope inconveniently interfered with the worldliness of the Crown and the nation, and they cordially combined in an act of *covert* and *indirect* rebellion against him whom they yet professed to recognise as their holy Father.

It is important to distinguish between such encroachments of the Crown as really, though indirectly, affected the spiritual (such as those we have just mentioned), and such as only affected the temporal rights of the Church,—such as the statute of mortmain, passed in the reign of Edward I. It is more important, however, to observe that the same spirit which dictated these encroachments on the temporal rights of the Church led to encroachments on the spiritual, so soon as it was seen to be requisite to control the spiritual for the sake of securing the temporal; and it must likewise be carefully kept in view that the chief causes for the concurrence of the laity with the Crown in constant encroachments upon the Church was that jealousy in respect to *money*, which led the laity and the clergy equally to complain of the payment of “first fruits,” or of the practice of Papal “provisions;” and these feelings, which were increasing in the nation all through the reigns of the first three Edwards, led logically, naturally, and necessarily to constant indirect interference with the exercise of the Pope’s spiritual powers, especially of excommunication, and to attempts to exclude his bulls or rescripts, under the pretence that they interfered with the royal prerogative; the truth being that they often interfered with royal *tyranny*, such as we have shewn sufficient specimens of. We read in Lingard that no prince seems to have carried this jealousy further than Edward II.; and it is curious, and serves to shew that the encroachments of the Crown—or rather, we should now say, of the State or secular power—were quite as much, or more, owing to the jealousy of the laity of the clergy, and the clergy as to the See of Rome (in consequence of their

worldliness and corruption), than to the rapacity of the Crown, that these encroachments should have gone to greater lengths under weak and unworthy princes, such as the second Edward and the second Richard, than under kings as powerful as the first and third Edwards. And it was in the reign of Richard II. that the most sweeping statute of *præmunire* was passed—that celebrated statute which was made by Henry VIII. the engine with which to enforce on the English clergy the acknowledgment of his spiritual supremacy, and which indeed was drawn in terms so large and loose as almost to include in its prohibitions any exercise of papal power which the Crown should choose to conceive, and get the Crown courts to adjudge, to be an interference with the royal “prerogative,” or rather the royal will. This is the statute which has of late been so often referred to, usually with the most intense ignorance. Its preamble (which is particularly instructive) recites that archbishops and bishops were “wont to make execution of the judgments” given in the king’s courts on presentments to churches, &c.; but “of late processes be made to our holy Father the Pope, and censures of excommunication *against certain Bishops of England* because they have made execution of such judgments;” *i. e.* of judgments of the king’s lay courts *upon and against* the spiritual rights of the Church—the appointment of pastors to their sees or cures, albeit these spiritual rights were connected with temporal endowments. The reader will remark that the recitals of this statute disclose the consummation of a new era in the history of the English Church—that hitherto it has been, at least generally, the “king and his nobles” who have been opponents of the Pope, now it is the whole body of the Bishops. Hitherto it has been usually in *defence* of the Bishops that the “censures and sentences of excommunication” of the Holy See were denounced; now it is *against* them. In short, it is plain that the Bishops were, with the king and his nobles, “*rebels*” against the supreme Pastor of the Church. And this is more plain from what follows: “And it is *said*” (by the Bishops) “that our holy Father the Pope hath purposed to translate certain prelates of the realm, and some out of the realm, without the *king’s assent, and without the assent of the said prelates.*” The king and his prelates are here, it is obvious, coupled together as co-conspirators against the Holy See. And how came they to have this common interest—this “*idem velle atque nolle*”—that certain sign of a corrupt community of motive and aim? The next sentence sufficiently explains: “Whereby our lord the king shall *lose the counsel and services of the said prelates;*” which “counsel and services,” it is

shewn by contemporary history, they were wont to render to "our lord the king" in certain secular offices (such as chancellor and treasurer), with which prelates had no proper concern, but which brought the said prelates great pelf and power and "pride of place." Here, then, it is obvious, it is the cloven hoof of sordid self-interest raised in rebellion against the Holy See, and a spirit of covert resistance to his spiritual authority, caused by a secret *love of secular employment and emoluments*, which his authority interfered with; and that the prelates were conscious of the unsafe ground they had ventured upon is plain from the shuffling and insidious character of the terms in which their assent is expressed in the preamble to this statute. They "protest that it is not in their mind *to affirm or deny* that our holy Father the Pope may excommunicate Bishops, or translate them without their assent," &c.,—(they durst not deny, and they could not affirm)—"but they say, that *if* such excommunications or translations be made so that the substance of the realm may be consumed," (as the Commons had alleged), "and that the same is against the king, his crown and regalty—the lords spiritual will be with the king in these cases—in *lawfully* maintaining his crown;" which, of course, they might well be without the least complaint on the part of their "holy Father the Pope." After such a crafty and hypocritical preamble, the reader will be prepared for the enacting part of the statute, which is contained in this short and oft-quoted and oft-misapplied sentence, of which it is sufficiently clear that the lords spiritual were thoroughly ashamed:

"That if any purchase or pursue any processes, sentences of excommunication, *bulls*, instruments, or other things *which touch the king, his crown, regalty, or realm*, they shall be put out of the king's protection. Now it is true that (as has been elsewhere, we conceive, legally proved,* and even in these articles sufficiently shewn) the crown and regalty comprised by the law of the land nothing spiritual, and was purely temporal. But then the *king's courts* of law would have to decide what *was* temporal; and we have recently had illustrations of the large meaning which a secular body would attach to that word; and how it will *perforce* be construed to include *any thing, however spiritual*, which is *inconvenient to the State*; as it *was* construed, too often, even in these times by judges who would be in peril of their lives for "contumacy."

That this statute, and all the others which it embraced and embodied, was not in *accordance* with the law, but was *contrary* to it, can be clearly seen from the facts already stated in these

* In the *Catholic Hierarchy vindicated*.

articles, and is confirmed by these farther and remarkable facts: that the bill was so opposed in the House of Lords that it was withdrawn, and a very unconstitutional kind of arrangement made by the Commons with the Crown that the king should alter it by the advice of his council, and that it should be laid before Parliament again; that it *never was again laid before Parliament*; and that it *does not appear upon the rolls of Parliament*. But there *does* appear upon the rolls of Parliament a protest of the Lords Spiritual that they consented to *no* enactment against the prerogative of the Pontiff with respect to provisions, or against the rights and liberties of the Church. It may therefore be contended that this statute, recently so much referred to as undoubted law, is not only in opposition to the common law, but *never was law itself*—never legally passed into an act of parliament!

Still, in point of *fact*, it was acted upon (whenever it suited the Crown to enforce it) to the extent already described, and therefore marks, in some degree, an indirect encroachment on the Church. The lay courts of the Crown judged what was an interference with the “crown and regalty” of the realm; and though it can be shewn in the law cases of succeeding reigns that the courts always upheld the distinctions between the spiritual and the temporal, as laid down by the earlier authorities, and restricted these statutes to the latter, they had the power, under such an act as that of Richard II., to do almost what they pleased, or what it might please the Crown to compel them to; and in an after age, when arbitrary power was established, they were always ready to enforce it against the Church whenever the Crown had a contest with her, or whenever the Crown chose to enter into conflict with, and seek to crush, any of her prelates or clergy.

What effect upon the Church and the country the Crown's interference with papal appointments had, was powerfully apparent in the reign of Henry V., when we find that both the Universities presented petitions to Convocation, setting forth that *while the Popes were permitted to confer benefices by provision, the preference had always been given to men of talents and industry, who had obtained degrees in the Universities*; but that since the passing of the acts against provisors, members of the Universities had been neglected by the patrons, the students had disappeared, and the schools were nearly abandoned. Sixteen years later the *House of Commons petitioned the king that the statutes against provisors might be repealed, or an adequate remedy provided*. He informed them that he had referred the matter to the bishops; but the *prelates had no wish that the statutes should be repealed*. These remark-

able facts convincingly demonstrate, it is conceived, the propositions for which we have contended, that the legislation against papal provisions was an *encroachment* contrary to the ancient law of the land, that it originated in sordid, selfish, and interested motives, and that it was injurious to the Church and to the country. Let us add, that Lingard states: "The persons who chiefly suffered from the practice of provisions, and who chiefly profited by the statutes against them, were *the higher orders of clergy, who had originally provoked the complaints against the system*, and now desired to prevent the repeal of a statute which secured to them the influence of patronage, and shielded them from the interference of the Pontiffs."

That these statutes were not regarded as really of legal authority, is shewn further by this: that they were very much allowed to be evaded by the judges in the ensuing reigns, even where the Crown sought to put them in execution; and cases constantly occur up to the reign of Henry VIII. in which the Pope's supreme power, either of deprivation or provision, is recognised* in the courts of law. Thus in several cases the court speaks of the Pope's power of deprivation, and in others of his power of collating or presenting. In one case in the reign of Henry IV., the chief-justice uses these remarkable words: "When the Pope (*l'apostle*) makes provision, he does so as *sovereign patron of holy Church*." Finally, in the 12th Henry VIII., only a few years before the breach with Rome, the law is impliedly recognised by the chief-justice speaking of an incumbent being "in possession by *collation of the Pope*."

Upon these grounds it is contended that all these statutes were successive encroachments upon the Church, contrary to the common law and ancient constitution of the realm, and caused by the rapacity of the Crown, and the sordid jealousy of the wealthier of the clergy and laity. That, in short, they were so many emphatic embodiments of that same cursed spirit of *mammon* which we shall see was the undermining cause of those statutes of Henry VIII., which were natural and inevitable consequences of the course pursued by the State in preceding reigns, being founded upon precisely the same principle—the determination to make the temporal supreme over the spiritual—the identical principle in our own times so often emphatically avowed by Lord John Russell (in worthy sympathy with the sentiments of the benefactor of his ancestor), and repeatedly enunciated in Parliament by erastian Protestants and subservient Catholics. That this was so, and that the encroachments upon the Church were really the result of the worldliness and corruption of the clergy, not less than

* See them cited in the *Catholic Hierarchy vindicated*.

of the rapacity of the Crown, is remarkably illustrated in that period of our history at which, in our review, we have now arrived—the period which intervened between the reigns of Richard II. and Richard III. inclusively, that is to say, chiefly the reigns of the three Henrys, IV., V., and VI., a period which likewise, and not less so, illustrates the *retribution* which is sure to be required for aggressions upon the Church. It is remarkable that the reign of Edward III., marked by the most deliberate legislative encroachment on the Church, was followed by a disgraceful and disastrous reign, which, as it witnessed the most decisive and comprehensive legislation against the Church, likewise, in its turn, was closed by successful rebellion, from which arose long and desolating wars, which ravaged England during the six succeeding reigns, almost utterly destroyed the English nobility, who had ever been the leaders in assaults on the Church, and by prostrating the power of the peers, so exalted that of the Crown that Henry VII. reigned more despotically than any former monarch, and by his rapacity paved the way for those further aggressions on the Church, in open robbery, plunder, and rapine, which could only be accomplished under cover of a religious reformation, or rather by fatal separation, heresy, and schism.

The progress and succession of all these influences—the close connexion of cause and effect between the events which they produced—their real character and ultimate inevitable result, are, we repeat, clearly illustrated in the era comprised under the reigns of the three Henries. And not the least instructive thing to be observed is, that the same spirit which prompted the peers to promote, and the people to acquiesce in, aggression on the papal supremacy, produced, and so proved its secret sympathy with, a spirit of *heresy*. Not long before the reign of the first of these monarchs, Henry IV., the most distinguished among those proud peers, who had been so eager to promote legislation against “provisions,” and against the exercise of the papal supremacy, and its enforcement by the sentence of excommunication—were found, in manifest and admonitory consistency, openly and impudently abetting the first great teacher of heresy, the hypocrite and impostor Wycliffe. When the arch-deceiver was summoned by the Archbishop to appear before him to answer the accusation of heresy, there appeared with him, in ostentatious avowal of contempt for the heads of the Church, the two most powerful subjects of the Crown—the Duke of Lancaster, and Percy the Earl Marshal, who ordered a chair to be given to Wycliffe; and on the prelate’s refusing this insolent demand, became so insulting in their demeanour, that the people rose in indig-

nation. The duke, the king's son, narrowly escaped with his life, and his palace was pillaged. The consequence was, that Wycliffe, deprived of that popular support which is the life of heresy, found it necessary to make the best apology in his power, and to submit to the imposition of silence on the subjects on which he had put forth his heretical ideas. It is impossible not to see that the *people* here saved the country and the Church, being yet not so far corrupted by those influences which had such a pernicious effect on the higher classes. It is interesting to observe that it was from no sympathy with the *heresy* of Wycliffe that John of Gaunt gave him his countenance; for so soon as he perceived him inclined to be obstinate in heretical opinions, he withdrew that countenance, which clearly had arisen from those feelings of aversion and jealousy towards the heads of the Church, which had led to so many aggressions upon her. Again, it is important to observe that Wycliffe was one of the higher and courtier class of clergy, who, on the one hand, we have seen were most worldly, and on the other hand, as the result of this worldliness, were most disposed to depress the Church by exalting the power of the Crown at the expense of that of the Pope: so true is it, and so instructive is it to observe, that heretics in all countries and in every age instinctively cling to the *secular* power, and shrink from the spiritual. Wycliffe was one of the *king's chaplains*; that very class who, so long ago as the age of the Confessor, had begun to bring in, through the hateful effect of royal favour and clerical corruption, the evil of plurality and worldliness and love of money; and as these men were the commencement of the decline of the Church, so they were its consummation; for we need scarcely remind our readers of Wycliffe's successor in the work of schism and heresy—Cranmer, who likewise was a king's chaplain. And so identical is the spirit of heresy, we find of the former as of the latter, that he endeavoured to promote the claims of the Crown against the supremacy of the Holy See; not, however, until after, like his successor, he had become party to an *appeal* to Rome, and had failed. Nor must it be unnoticed, that in Wycliffe's case, as in Cranmer's, the claim he had carried to Rome was an iniquitous one; for it arose from that same worldly and rapacious spirit to which we have traced his patron's legislative aggressions upon the Church. There is yet another thing important to be noticed in this episode of Wycliffe,—that expressive illustration of the intimate and instinctive sympathy between the spirit of worldliness and of heresy, and the inevitable connexion of both with rebellion against the papal supremacy,—that it exhibited

that uniform accompaniment of heresy, *hypocrisy*; for he who was so worldly himself, a rapacious pluralist, and a courtier preferment-seeking cleric, preached most pathetically against the evils of worldliness in others, and one of his main errors was that the clergy should not hold worldly wealth.

And this leads us to a very instructive passage in the history of the reign of Henry IV., which amply illustrates and confirms all that previous citations have tended to shew. A sect had arisen who had carried out Wycliffe's heretical ideas, especially as to the possession of property by the clergy, to a fanatical extent. Towards the end of the reign, in 1407, they attracted the attention of the Lords, who sent a petition (or "bill") to the Commons for their concurrence, which was afterwards presented by the speaker to the king. It recited that "the preachers excited the people to take away the possessions of the Church, of which the clergy were as assuredly endowed as temporal lords were of their inheritances; and that unless these evil purposes were speedily resisted, it was probable that, in process of time, they would also move the people to take away the possessions and inheritances of the temporal lords." How prophetic of that retributive sequel of the Reformation—the Rebellion! But now, let it be observed, four years later, Henry asked a "fifteenth" of the laity and a "tenth" of the clergy. Both bodies resisted; but the *Commons, to shift the burden from themselves, advised the king to lay it on the Church.* From her *superfluous* revenues (they pretended) he might maintain a large army, and also (incomparable hypocrisy! how it reminds one of the "not that he cared for the poor" of Judas, the betrayer of Christ—fit precursor of these betrayers of the Church!) *support one hundred hospitals for the relief of the poor.* When the king called for the grounds of their calculation, they had none to offer, and he treated the proposition with well-merited contempt; thus proving that by this time the kings, bad as they were, were better than the upper orders of the laity. And it is unaccountable how any writers upon the Reformation, whether Protestant or Catholic, should have omitted to attach due importance to the significant fact that scarcely more than a century before that shocking catastrophe, its dread drama of confiscation should have been thus *sketched out by the Commons of England, and rejected with scorn by the Crown!*

And this appears the proper time for mentioning, that in the next reign statutes were passed, which Henry VIII., when he put in execution this shameful scheme of the Commons, must have found useful precedents, as we shall see hereafter.

Before citing some of their terms, we must mention that the rejection by the Crown of the Commons' scheme of confiscation seems to *have quenched their zeal against heresy*; for we find that they sought to shrink from their bill against the "Lollards," which, however, remained law, the first formal act against heresy on our statute-book.

Here, however, want of space compels us to pause. In our next No. the subject will be brought to its conclusion.

Passion, Love, and Rest;

OR,

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF BASIL MORLEY.

(Concluded from p. 207.)

CHAPTER XII. — *Rest.*

AFTER the wedding tour, Edith and I returned to Morley Court, where my father wished us to live, as he could not bear the thought of absolute solitude. There we passed our days, enjoying to the full the many blessings we possessed, both spiritual and temporal. Cumberland was a frequent visitor, and I now and then reminded him of what he had said to me respecting the troubles with which even the life of a Catholic is ever chequered. Whenever I said any thing in this strain, he bade me beware, not of sorrow, not of pleasure, but of myself.

"Our worst enemy," he used to repeat, "rely upon it, is within us. In fact, self is too often a *traitor*. Life, my dear Morley, is only beginning with you. Trust God, and distrust yourself, and all will be well in the end; but don't flatter yourself that as yet you know much of the struggle of life. When you least expect it, the conflict will begin."

In some way or other these words of his made a considerable impression on me, though on my thoughts rather than on my feelings. A few months after my marriage, a silent fear of some unknown evil began to creep over me. The very cloudlessness of my existence was at times too painful to bear. I trembled lest some unforeseen accident should happen to mar our enjoyments or plunge us into calamity. Then I began to ponder over all the possible ills of mortality, and all the great spiritual trials which I had heard or read of

as being the lot of Christians in this life. If I were to reckon up all the imaginary evils which at one time or another I thought over as within the limits of possibility, the catalogue would be little short of the ridiculous. I pursued this plan with the especial object of being prepared for trial when it came. I had no wish (as I imagined) to escape trial altogether, but I wanted not to be taken unawares, thinking that so I should suffer less when sorrow should come. Cumberland clearly saw in what direction my thoughts were used to wander, for he now and then gave me a hint as to the evil of wishing to *choose* our own cross. But I did not then understand him, and he wisely left me to learn by experience what could really be learnt in no other way.

We had been married a year and a half, when Edith became a mother. She was dangerously ill, and for some time her life was despaired of. Then I felt what human agony can amount to. She was prepared for death, but her state was such that I was scarcely permitted to see her, as the agitation would certainly have killed her. With all the sincerity that prayer and struggle could win for me, I made an offering of her to Almighty God, and resigned her into his hands. The cross was fearful to bear, but I stretched out my hands to receive it, and hoped that I was doing it with a perfect will. Suddenly her illness took a favourable turn, and she recovered with unusual rapidity. The infant thrived, was baptised, and again life was full of joy and hope to us both.

One morning I had remarked how completely all traces of illness had left my wife's countenance, and after a short walk with her, I rode over to Cumberland, to ask a question on some immaterial subject. He proposed to ride with me part of the way back, and told me he was about to leave home for a short time on a very difficult and delicate errand, and asked my prayers for its success.

"I am going to visit the Blessed Sacrament before I start," said he, "as I generally do on such occasions; so I shall keep you a few minutes. Suppose you come into the chapel too; one never knows what may happen next, and there are few preparations for the future like those made in the presence of Jesus Christ himself. I want also to shew you a little picture I have just had sent me by a friend from Rome. It is one of those representations which are common enough in Catholic countries, but still rather rare here, though I have no doubt the day will come when they will be seen in almost every Catholic church and chapel in England."

We entered the chapel, and Cumberland pointed out the picture to me. It was small, and as a work of art of slender

pretensions, yet with nothing critically objectionable. It was a figure of our Blessed Lord, shewing his divine Heart, as it were uncovered in his breast. He was represented pointing to it; and underneath were written the words, "My son, give me thy heart." We looked at it for a short time, and then knelt down before the altar. As I bowed down before the Mysterious Presence, the words I had just read seemed to come forth from the tabernacle, and to call me to a more complete surrender of myself to Him who had given himself without sparing for me. Feebly, yet earnestly, I responded to his call, and remained scarcely conscious of any presence but his, and looking forward to the day when I hoped to see Him without veil, and to hear his voice, not only by faith, but coming forth from his throne in heaven; when a touch on my shoulder from Cumberland recalled me to the work of the moment, and we left the chapel. He must have seen traces of unusual emotion in my countenance, for he said nothing during our ride, and when we parted, shook my hand with more than his wonted cordiality, only saying, "Pray for me."

I reached home, pondering on the unspeakable blessedness of the Catholic faith even in this life, and thanking God for the gift He had given me. Entering the hall-door, I started to see one of the servants hurrying towards me, his face pale and terrified.

"For God's sake," I cried, "what is the matter? Where is Mrs. Morley? Where is my father?"

"They are well, sir," said the man; "it is the child!"

I rushed past him upstairs. Two or three maids were standing outside my wife's room, whispering and crying. I threw open the door, but at first saw nothing. Then I perceived Edith on her knees at her bedside, her face buried in her hands, while her whole frame shook with the agitation she was suffering. Before her lay the infant, cold and dead. She heard my cry, but only stretched out one of her hands towards me. I seized it and knelt by her side. Her tears then began to stream fast, and she murmured again and again, "Jesus! Mary!" I could say nothing; but my thoughts in the chapel recurred with piercing force, and it almost seemed as if the words, "My son, give me thy heart," were really breathed into my ears.

Oh, mystery of love and suffering! How can I describe all that mingled tide of anguish, and gratitude, and fear, and joy, and humiliation, and peace, which swept into my heart during the minutes that I passed kneeling before my child's motionless body! At last we grew calmer, and by a simul-

taneous impulse arose. Edith was composed, to a degree that seemed almost miraculous; and from that hour I never heard the faintest shade of murmur pass her lips. For many weeks she suffered much, but her conversation about her infant was full of peace and gratitude; and after the funeral she told me that she had that day known a depth of sorrow and a depth of happiness such as she had never even imagined before.

For myself, I felt the infant's death far more than I had thought possible. But it had this happy effect on me, that Cumberland's often-repeated warning about wanting to choose my own crosses had now a more living and practical force on my whole life. In all my surmises and anticipations, so it happened that I had never thought of my child's sudden death. The surprise, therefore, added to the keenness of the shock; so that, though the loss of a young infant is one of the gentlest of all the afflictions with which a Catholic parent can be tried, yet it gave me a knowledge of myself to which hitherto I had been almost a stranger.

We soon got into our old routine of life again; but Edith's health not being very good, the doctor advised travelling and change of scene. My father, who, though still a Protestant, was greatly attached to Edith, travelled with us. We sometimes, though not often, talked on the great question. One day he had seemed remarkably moved by what I had said respecting the spiritual *power* of Catholicism, and its independence of all human means for its support and propagation. He admitted that Catholics did seem to possess a knowledge of the invisible world, and a faculty for communion with God and the Saints, wholly unknown to the best of Protestants. This was ever a truth which commanded my own especial admiration, as it was a perception of the spiritual and intellectual hollowness of every form of Protestantism which had first driven me to examine into the claims of the Catholic Church.

That same evening I was walking alone among the ruins of a venerable abbey near the town of —, where we were to pass the following day, which was Sunday. The setting sun shone softly through the shattered tracery, and gave a kind of ethereal life to the wreck of ancient Catholic splendour which lay all around me, now silent for centuries. At such a time who could help re-peopling the shadowy aisles with kneeling worshippers, and inhaling in imagination the cloud of incense as it rose before the altar which had stood where now thistles and brambles alone were seen? "Oh, wonderful faith," I murmured to myself, "which nothing human can destroy! It fell in its days of riches, only to re-

vive in its days of poverty. And still more incomprehensible unbelief! How *can* this nation remain in its blindness? How *can* such a man as my father content himself with the shadow, when the substance is within his grasp? How is it *possible* to be a Protestant? How stupid, how inconsistent, how unattractive, how unspiritual, how baseless, is Protestantism, at its best! Really," I thought, "I can hardly understand the state of mind which rejects it; and yet I hear of Catholics themselves who are conscious of difficulties, though of course they do not yield to them in any such way as to have any admitted doubts against the faith. Oh, if Protestants only knew what it *is* to be a Catholic, they must yield at once!"

Returning to the inn where we were lodging, I found the priest who had the charge of the mission of — in conversation with my father and my wife. A less attractive person, at first sight, I had seldom seen. Square-built and short, with no trace of the ecclesiastic in his dress, barbarous in his pronunciation of English, possessing (as I soon found) a very slight knowledge of Latin, and altogether guiltless of Greek, what with the uncouthness of his manners, his misplaced aspirates, and his evident want of general education, I sat on thorns during his visit, fearing the injurious effect his very unromantic character might have on my father's nascent faith in the Catholic Church. After a tolerably long visit, Mr. Smith (which was his name) took his leave.

"A good, honest, straightforward sort of a man, that, Basil!" cried my father, as our visitor's retreating footsteps were heard down the creaking staircase of the country inn. Infinitely relieved, I blundered forth an acquiescence, and in a few minutes it was arranged that we should request Mr. Smith to dine with us on the following day.

My father, of course, went with us to Mass, and I trembled with anxiety lest the mode of its celebration should be such as should repel his somewhat fastidious taste. My worst anticipations, so far as the service was concerned, were realised. The chapel was dark, dingy, and Protestant-looking. A few vulgarly smart shopkeepers occupied the best seats, and the chapel, small as it was, was not full. The music was frivolous, and below criticism. The vestments were ugly and dirty, and the serving boys careless in their demeanour. Two of the candles on the altar would not burn, and one of the boys fidgetted about for five or ten minutes in vain attempts to rekindle them. There were long English prayers before and after Mass, recited in a semi-Protestant tone by Mr. Smith, and responded to in a nasal gabble by the serving boys alone, the congregation remaining perfectly silent. The

sermon was indescribably dull, and had only one merit—brevity. When all was over, as we lingered in the chapel, the priest came out, insisted on our coming into his house, shewed us all the contents of his sacristy and sitting-room, and would not rest until he had pointed out to my father every item of certain dilapidated religious ornaments of the worst possible design and execution. Edith took it all quietly, my father was unaffectedly interested and good-humoured, and I was most uncomfortably nervous. As soon as the approach of our dinner-hour gave me an excuse, I hurried the whole party away to our inn, and at one o'clock we sat down together. A chance question of mine, as to the circumstances of the mission, started Mr. Smith off in a direction which I thought must be fatal to our hopes of my father's conversion. Such a picture as he drew I had never heard before. The chapel was overburdened with debt, and the congregation was distracted with squabbles, one half of them being scarcely civil to their priest, on account of the bishop's dismissal of his predecessor against their wishes; there was no school, either on Sundays or week-days; the organist and half the choir were Protestants, who appeared to conduct the music pretty much according to their own discretion; and poor Mr. Smith himself seemed to think all these things unavoidable, natural evils, to be acquiesced in, as the inevitable results of the Protestantism, or bigotry (as he called it) of the English nation. As for hoping to make any impression on the Protestantism around him, in the way of conversions, it did not seem to enter his mind as a possibility. According to his views, the Catholic faith had neither power to convert the Protestant world, nor to rule the hearts of Catholics themselves. Meanwhile he ate an enormous dinner, with abundant apologies for so doing.

Here was a realisation of my dreams of the preceding evening. "What *will* my father say?" I exclaimed to myself. "Was there ever any thing more unlike one's ideal of an apostolic ecclesiastic than this good Mr. Smith? What a pretty illustration has he given us of the *power* of Catholicism over the heart and intellect!" Thus reflecting, we went to the afternoon service, such as it was. There were a few prayers, a little catechising, or rather a formal repeating of a part of the Catechism by a few children, in presence of a very small congregation. After this came Benediction, with a *minimum* of solemnity in every point. Though I have no knowledge of music, the singing was, even to my ears, poor and disagreeable; and Edith told me afterwards, that to a cultivated taste it was excruciating. Of course nothing could *quite* spoil the

spiritual beauty or destroy the ineffable sweetness of the solemn rite itself, and I trusted that its influence on my father would be good. However, though he seemed serious, he said little or nothing on the subject till the next morning, when, to my extreme surprise, he proposed to prolong our stay at —, for the purpose of seeing a little more of Mr. Smith, to whom he avowed he had taken quite a fancy.

"Thank God!" I cried in my secret heart, as Edith and I gladly acquiesced in the proposal; and for the next week Mr. Smith was our constant visitor. My father incessantly introduced the subject of the Catholic religion, and talked and argued eagerly. To my mind, Smith's controversial powers were poor in the extreme, and I reflected that, had I myself met with no better a reasoner, I should have remained a Protestant to that very hour. To my father, on the contrary, whose mind was unimpressed with *any* theological creed, the good priest's simple statements of Catholic doctrine came as a revelation from Almighty God; and I was as much edified as I was struck at perceiving the marvellous power which the truths of Catholicism possessed of making their way direct into the open and candid heart and intelligence, even when recommended by no earthly art or grace. It soon grew clear that, humanly speaking, the period of my father's conversion was simply a question of time, and so it proved. A visit which he paid to a poor dying man in company with the priest finally determined him; and a fortnight after our arrival at —, we had the unspeakable delight of hearing him make his profession of faith.

Meanwhile the progress of my own thoughts became daily more trying. The contrast between my father's devout simplicity and my own critical fastidiousness at once humbled and alarmed me. Sudden scruples and spiritual difficulties sprung up and oppressed me. I again grew morbidly self-contemplative, and unhappily I was now far away from my friend Cumberland and his discerning and affectionate advice. I went to confession to Mr. Smith; but he gave me no aid, and seemed scarcely to understand my troubles. "There's no malice in that," said he, in reply to my anxious statements of what I fancied might be sins, or a voluntary trifling with the occasions of sins. No doubt he was right, strictly speaking; but the practical result of his rough and undiscerning guidance—or rather of his declining all real guidance—was to throw me back upon myself at the moment when an enlightened spiritual direction was of the first importance.

The evil thus commenced continued to gather force throughout our journeyings, which soon re-commenced. I was pos-

sessed with a passion for comparing my own spiritual state with that of every Catholic I met with, and from every comparison drew fresh materials for self-torment. We had introductions to, or made ourselves acquainted with, Catholics of all classes, and a considerable variety we met with; but every one seemed happier, if not better than I was. Every where, however, the same effects followed. If I became acquainted with persons of great devotion and evident saintliness, I was miserable at my own worldliness. If I came across a coarse, vulgar, every-day sort of Catholic, I was annoyed and shocked. At last my feelings began to take a definite and more torturing shape. The thought struck me,—“Am I following out my right vocation? Are my temptations the result of some fatal original error of which I was guilty after I became a Catholic? Is not my want of devotion, and my anxiety about worldly things, the consequence of my being in a state of life to which God did not intend to call me? What if He had designed me for the monastic or the ecclesiastical state?” The misery of such thoughts may well be imagined, and unfortunately for many months I met with no confessor who was able to relieve my scruples. In some way or other we seemed to stumble upon a series of priests who regarded the life of a person living in the world as necessarily more or less a *worldly* life, in the bad sense of the word. The very idea of a young and rich married man like myself troubling himself about *perfection* was evidently a phenomenon strange to their theology; and the natural consequence was, that whenever I did extract any thing in the shape of definite guidance, it invariably made matters worse than before. My soul could find no *rest*. The more I read on the subject of the importance of finding one's true vocation, the more was I agitated at the recollection of my neglect of all such considerations at the time of my marriage.

Thus situated, it was but natural that my former fancies for anticipating the trials and crosses which God would send me should return in a new and more distressing shape. “There is no cure for me,” I began to imagine, “but losing my dear wife. Such a blow as that must certainly be my portion. Then I *can* turn to the ecclesiastical state, and labour for the souls of this poor, unbelieving people, dying in myriads about me, with no knowledge of the truths that would save them.” I shuddered at my own thoughts; but they clung to me like the horrible imaginations which frighten a timid child. By degrees my health and spirits were visibly affected; and when at last we reached Morley Court, my wife improved in health, and my father full of child-like happiness in his religion, I

had contrived to reduce my own peace to the lowest possible ebb. Cumberland, who called the day after our arrival, instantly remarked the change in my look and manner, and the first time we were alone, asked me the cause with manifest anxiety. I unbosomed myself without a concealment to him, and told him all. He paused when I had done, and then said,

“Why did you not write to me?”

I told him I had thought I could wait till I saw him; and he then continued:

“And I suppose you blame *me* for saying nothing to you about these things immediately after your conversion?”

“Far from it,” I replied; “it never occurred to me that *you* were to blame.”

“But should I *not* have been to blame, if I had seen you, my penitent and friend, resisting the vocation of Almighty God, and had said nothing to you on so momentous and awful a subject?”

“Then why did you say nothing?” I asked.

“Because I saw not the faintest shadow of a sign that you had any vocation to the priesthood; your state and prospects suggested marriage and a position in the world, as your natural duty, unless God gave tokens of his having other destinies for you. But He gave no such tokens. You shewed not the slightest inclination to the ecclesiastical state; you fell in love almost immediately after your conversion. Almighty God by his grace never suggested to you a momentary doubt that you might be doing wrong. In short, to tell you the truth, my dear Morley, a more unfit young gentleman as a candidate for the priesthood—(begging your pardon, of course)—I never saw.”

I felt, and no doubt looked amazed; and he proceeded:

“Depend upon it, Morley, you did perfectly right in marrying; God has blessed your marriage, to your wife, your father, your friends, and (notwithstanding all these temptations) to yourself too. Don’t be afraid. These doubts come from the devil; and I’ll tell you what he wants of you. He wants to get you to abstain from seeking perfection *in* your vocation, from a diseased fancy that you have mistaken that vocation. I know well enough that the married life is a lower one than the monastic and sacerdotal; but what is that to you, when Almighty God has pleased to call you to it? I, whom I trust He *has* called to be a priest, might just as reasonably be cast down because He has made me a man, and not an angel. As to your absurd fancies about your wife’s death and all the rest of it, I charge you, in the most solemn manner, to put them away from you, as you would abstain from a dose of poison.

Rely upon it, they come straight from the devil; and there is this one proof of it, among plenty of others, that they agitate and torment you, and unfit you for your present duties. Be ever assured, under all circumstances, that the Spirit of God is the spirit of peace, humility, and contentment; and whenever it pleases Him to give any special guidance to any soul, the *invariable* mark of his presence is the increase of repose and calm faith and love which He sheds upon it. Let me remind you, my dear Morley, of my old warning, 'Trust God, and distrust yourself.' You know I always told you that you would be your own worst enemy. Come, tell me, is it not so?"

I confessed the truth of what he said; and after a little more conversation on the same subject, I made up my mind, and promised him strict obedience to his injunctions. For a time all went well with me; or rather, I should say, went better, for the same temptations ceased not to harass me more or less for many months afterwards. Increasing as I was in religious knowledge, and sincerely (so far as I could judge) as I obeyed Cumberland's injunctions, still I was haunted with the fear lest my salvation depended on some great change in my outward circumstances, in my mode of life, or on my taking some extraordinary steps towards the observance of the evangelical counsels. Honestly as I struggled against what I saw clearly to be hindrances to my performance of *undoubted* duties, still the effect—at least temporarily—was injurious and most painful. I never could satisfy myself as to whether I had *consented* to this or that temptation, while in the still disturbed condition of my mind, my imagination remained so morbidly susceptible as to be peculiarly sensitive to those mere *impressions* from the incursion of temptations which it is always so difficult to distinguish from an actual voluntary entertaining of the tempter's suggestions. My natural cheerfulness of course suffered in proportion, conscious as I was that a gloomy, disheartened condition of mind is most unfavourable to spiritual health. One of the chief consolations was ever this—that I incessantly placed myself unreservedly in the hands of Almighty God, and trusted undoubtedly to the intercession of our Blessed Lady, with a confidence that *in the end* all would be well.

Cumberland never omitted, when I spoke to him on the subject, to warn me against expecting rest from inward warfare so long as life should last, and against expecting any temptation to cease, merely through the change in some external circumstances.

"Your soul, my dear Morley," he would say, "is in the

hands of God. The moment He thinks fit to set you free from any perplexity, He will do it. Wait on *Him*, and take my word for it, you will find that perhaps when you least expect it, the storms will cease, and the sunshine break forth. No created being *knows* your soul; I, your spiritual director, can only judge of its character superficially; the devil, your enemy, tempts you at hazard, with all his cunning; perhaps you yourself know even less of yourself than either I or your deadly foe; God alone sees you as you are, and just at the moment when it pleases Him, does He console you, or strengthen you, or suffer you to be cast down."

Thus time flowed on, I myself ever striving not to lose heart, and to give myself cheerfully, thankfully, and hopefully to the performance of present duties. I now perceive distinctly what is right, and I *think* I try to do it; but even while I write my story, the same terrible snares beset me, and the desire to know more of myself than God has thought fit to reveal, and to anticipate the coming events and crosses of my life, intrudes itself and clouds my peace. Yet after all I see my path clear for the present hour. In a thankful acquiescence in the presence of this trial is my rest; for it is the will of God that it should attend me *now*, whatever be his will hereafter.

Postscript written by MR. CUMBERLAND.

Who, indeed, can calculate on the coming hour? My poor friend Mr. Morley—than whom a more simple-hearted, devout Catholic scarcely exists—has placed in my hands these paragraphs, the last ever traced by his son. Surely I am not presumptuous in trusting that in their revelations of his struggles, I see the rapid progress of young Basil Morley to a fitness for that tremendous moment which so early brought him into the presence of his God and Judge. Within a week after he wrote the above sentences, his soul was in eternity. A fever, caught we know not how, has made his father childless and his wife a widow. From the moment the illness began, his inward troubles ceased. "Ah! my dear friend," he said to me, when I saw him first after it was known that he could not recover, "the ways of God are not our ways; but I have no will but his will." He had literally no sorrows, except for his wife and his father; but the confidence he expressed in the goodness of Almighty God to console and strengthen them, and in the intercession of Mary and the Saints, was as great as I have ever witnessed. His father and wife are too much stunned to know as yet what they feel; but they recognise the love as well as the power of Him who knows when the

appointed work of each one of his servants is ended, and then takes them away from amongst us; teaching us by this, as by every other manifestation of his power, that we are nothing, that we know nothing, and that the soul has no *rest*, save in uniting her will with his, that she may become what He would have her, whether for a long and active life or a speedy death.

Reviews.

ANIMAL MAGNETISM.

Letters to a candid Inquirer on Animal Magnetism. By William Gregory, M.D. F.R.S.E., Professor of Chemistry in the University of Edinburgh. London, Taylor and Walton.

It is now three quarters of a century since a German physician, by name Anton Mesmer, on the occasion of his admittance to the degree of doctor of medicine in the University of Vienna, published an inaugural thesis on the influence of the planets on the human body. This was the first public announcement (at least in modern times) of a belief in the existence of what is now called Animal Magnetism, or Mesmerism, or, by a still later phrase, adapted to one section of its phenomena, Electro-biology.

During this period animal magnetism has encountered the severest storms of ridicule, argument, denunciation, and condemnation which ever assailed a nascent opinion. Trodden down in one place, it has sprung up in another; abhorred by many Christians because advocated by certain infidels and atheists, it has won its converts from among its most contemptuous opponents; attributed by one person to the devil, by another to imposture, by another to transparent folly; still it lives, and prospers, and gains advocates from men of almost every rank and class of mind, and in every civilised country.

To shut our eyes, therefore, to its existence, or treat it as a thing fit only for the thoughts of knaves or dreamers, is no longer possible. Whether true or false, the believers in its reality have become so numerous and so respectable, and the kind of evidence which they put before us is so singularly manifold, and to all appearance so irrefragable, that it has become almost a matter of duty to inform ourselves of the details of a subject, possessing—we do not hesitate to say—an interest of a character nothing less than *fearful*. As Catholics,

moreover, we cannot forget that the proper ecclesiastical authority has been more than once definitely consulted in the matter; and that therefore it is well that we should know how far it is lawful for us to be in any way concerned in practices which possess all that terrible fascination which, in other ages, tempted so many to the unhallowed devices of sorcery and witchcraft. A very satisfactory text-book from which to gather the necessary information has just been sent forth by the Professor of Chemistry in the University of Edinburgh; and from Dr. Gregory's pages we shall draw at sufficient length to enable our readers to form some idea of what animal magnetism professes to do with those who become subjected to its influence. Dr. Gregory's position is such, and the character of the many persons to whom he repeatedly refers by name is also such, that it is beyond the limits of possibility that he should be consciously the vehicle of an imposture; while it is almost equally difficult to imagine that, in a vast number of the cases referred to, any thing like deception could be practicable. We do not undertake, however, to express any opinion of our own on the subject. We merely repeat Dr. Gregory's statements, premising that similar statements are made by hundreds and hundreds of other persons, many of them of undeniable acuteness and unimpeachable veracity. For ourselves, we should state that, personally, we have never witnessed any of the mesmeric phenomena; but at the same time we have received many accurate details from various friends (Catholic as well as Protestant) which precisely fall in with the accounts published by Dr. Gregory and the many other believers in the science (so called) of animal magnetism.

Dr. Gregory himself, so far as his character may be judged from his book, is very far from sharing the sceptical views of some of the most notorious mesmerists. He is a Scotch Protestant, but he seems to have a sincere though not very accurately defined belief in the inspiration of the Bible, and in the reality of the Christian miracles. He also declares himself to be alive to the paramount authority of the moral law of Almighty God as the *only* standard by which our actions are to be guided; and there is nothing in his book which would justify us in imputing insincerity to him in his declarations. That he should shew himself incredibly blind to the one *great* moral objection to the practice of mesmerism, is but the result of the defective morality of Protestantism: and we must do him the justice to say, that (so far as we know) his blindness on this point is shared by every other Protestant who has come forward whether as an advocate or an opponent of the science. It need scarcely perhaps be added, that Dr. Gregory has

omitted to inquire *what* the authorities of the Catholic Church have really decreed on the subject, and that he has no scruple in attributing to her that which is not true, on the merest popular report of her ignorant enemies. With these drawbacks our readers will find in Dr. Gregory's volume a calm and dispassionate outline of the arguments in favour of the reality of animal magnetism, with an able discussion of the objections of its adversaries, and a repertory of facts of the most ample variety and the most astounding character. It will of course be impossible for us to give any thing more than a brief sketch of the more striking phenomena for whose truth Dr. Gregory vouches; and for the rest we must refer the curious inquirer to his book. Having done this, we shall lay before our readers the decrees which have been judicially promulgated by the competent Catholic authorities in condemnation of certain mesmeric practices, together with one or two considerations which will justify these decrees in the eyes of every person of unbiassed moral sense.

The mesmeric theory, then, asserts that it is possible by artificial means to induce in many, if not in all persons, a species of sleep corresponding to what is commonly called somnambulism. In this condition the sleeper possesses extraordinary powers, which enable him not only to dispense with the ordinary instrumentality of the senses, but to work results to which the natural senses in their waking state are totally incompetent. *What* is the precise nature of the instrument by which the magnetised patient thus works, the advocates of the theory do not pretend to say, except that they maintain that it is a purely *natural* means, and neither satanic nor in any sense supernatural. With perfect justice they allege, that this inability to explain the nature of magnetism (as it is called) furnishes no ground for disbelieving its palpable *effects*. In reality, we know little or nothing of the real nature of *any* natural agents. *What* is electricity? *What* is the attraction of gravity? *What* is animal and vegetable life itself? No human intelligence can tell. *How* it is that by an act of volition I can lift my hand, is in truth as unfathomable a mystery as that a magnetised person should perceive what is taking place on the other side of a brick wall. It is familiarity alone which causes us to be unimpressed with the awfully incomprehensible character of *every thing* that is around and within us.

The mode in which this magnetic sleep is produced is thus described by Dr. Gregory :

“ If you will try the experiment of drawing the points of the fingers of your right hand, without contact but very near, over the

hands of several persons, downwards from the wrist, the hands being held with the palms upwards, and your fingers either all abreast, or one following the other, and repeat this, slowly, several times, you will most probably find one or more who distinctly perceive a peculiar sensation, which is not always the same in different persons. Some will feel a slight warmth, others a slight coolness, others a pricking; some a tingling, others a numbness. Such as perceive these sensations most distinctly may then be tested, and will be found, probably, very clear and consistent with themselves, even if blindfolded. But sometimes blindfolding produces at once a state of nervous disturbance, most unfavourable to clear perception. All this I have often tried and seen; and Reichenbach, as well as many others, has minutely described it.

“You may now, having found a person susceptible to a certain extent, proceed to try the effect of passes, made slowly with both your hands, downwards from the crown of the patient’s head, over the face, to the pit of the stomach, or even down to the feet, always avoiding contact, but keeping as near as possible without contact. Or you may make the passes laterally, and so downwards over the arms. It is necessary to act with a cool, collected mind, and a firm will, while the patient is perfectly passive and undisturbed by noise or otherwise. He ought to look steadily at the eyes of the operator, who, in his turn, ought to gaze firmly on his subject. The passes should be continued, patiently, for some time, and will generally excite the sensations above mentioned, warmth, coolness, pricking, tingling, creeping of the skin, or numbness, according to the individual operated on. When these sensations are very marked, the subject will, in all probability, turn out a good one. It is probable that, with patience and perseverance, a vigorous, healthy operator would finally succeed in affecting all persons; but in some cases, which have afterwards become very susceptible, the subjects have been only affected with great difficulty, and only after much perseverance, or even have not been at all affected on the first trial, nay even for many successive trials. The operator must not be discouraged. If he perseveres, the chances of success are much increased, while he will often meet with cases in which a few minutes suffice to produce strong effects.

“Another, and in some cases a more successful method, is to sit down close before the patient, to take hold of his thumbs in your thumbs and fingers, and, gently pressing them, to gaze fixedly in his eyes, concentrating your mind upon him, while he does the same. This is, at least in the beginning, less fatiguing than making the accustomed motions of passes, although, with a little practice, it is easier to make several hundreds of passes uninterruptedly. I cannot give decided preference to either method. Both will occasionally fail, and both are often successful. They may be combined, that is, alternated, and often with advantage.

“Two things are desirable. First, a passive and willing state of mind in the patient, although faith in magnetism is not at all indis-

pensable; but a *bona fide* passivity, or willingness to be acted on. This, however, signifies little in susceptible cases. Secondly, intense concentration on the part of the operator. It is self-evident that, to attain this, perfect silence is essential. Even the noises in the street will often distract both parties from the necessary attention, and still more, whispering among the company, moving about, the rustling of a lady's dress, &c. &c. The time required varies from a minute or two to an hour or more, but usually diminishes on repetition.

"Intent gazing alone, especially if practised by both parties, will often produce the sensations above described, without close proximity. I have often seen Mr. Lewis, who likes this mode of operating, namely, gazing at a certain distance, with intensity and a firm volition, produce these sensations, and even stronger effects, in the space of five minutes, on a considerable proportion of the company, varying perhaps from 5 to 20 or 25 per cent, according to circumstances. But his power of concentration is truly astonishing, and is strongly indicated in his whole gesture, and in the expression of his countenance, while operating.

"Lastly, these sensations may be produced by gazing, on the part of the patient alone, either at a small object in his hand, as practised by Dr. Darling with great success, or at an object placed above and before the eyes, as is done with equal success by Mr. Braid in producing hypnotism. Indeed, one difficulty in these cases is, to prevent the subject from going further, and becoming unconscious.

"Such is a general account of the phenomena which first present themselves, which are not very striking, and of the processes usually followed. Indeed many are ready to say, that these phenomena are due only to the silence and constraint of the experiment, and therefore prove nothing. But such a remark only applies to the faintest sensations. When strongly marked, they are quite unmistakable, and cannot, by any possibility, be ascribed to any thing but a real influence, which, according to the form of experiment, may be either external or internal.

"Now, the same processes, when continued longer, give rise to phenomena still more striking; and I shall now proceed to these, while it will be unnecessary to repeat the detail of the processes, which, as already described, suffice to produce the whole train of magnetic phenomena.

"The first is, a twitching of the eyelids, which begin to droop, while, even when the eyelids remain open, there is in many cases a veil, as it were, drawn before the eyes, concealing the operator's face and other objects. Now, also, comes on a drowsiness, and, after a time, consciousness is suddenly lost; and on awaking, the patient has no idea whatever how long it is since he fell asleep, nor what has occurred during his sleep. The whole is a blank; but he generally wakes, with a deep sigh, rather suddenly, and says he has had a very pleasant sleep, without the least idea whether for five minutes or for five hours."

The phenomena of this state are the following, as given by Dr. Gregory:

“ 1. It is a state of somnambulism, sleep-walking, or more correctly sleep-waking. It is a sound, calm, undisturbed sleep; that is, it is not broken by gleams of ordinary consciousness. But the sleeper answers when spoken to by the operator, and answers rationally and sensibly. He frequently doubts, and therefore frequently uses the words, ‘ I don’t know,’ and appears most anxious not to affirm or deny any thing of which he is not quite sure. If desired, he will rise and walk; and according to the particular stage in which he may be, he walks with more or less confidence and security, his eyes being always closed, or, if found open, either turned up or insensible to light. In short, he is a somnambulist, and possesses some means, not possessed in the ordinary state, of becoming aware of the presence of objects.”

2. The sleeper sometimes hears with marvellously increased acuteness. “ Many cases of sleep-walking are recorded in which no sound, however loud, was heard by the somnambulist, and some in which very loud noises suddenly and dangerously awoke him, whereas less loud sounds had not been noticed. The state of utter deafness to all sounds, however loud, such as shouting or firing a pistol, or ringing a large bell, close to the ear, is very common in the magnetic sleep, and may be produced in every case at some stage of it, or, by the will of the operator, at almost any stage.

“ 3. When the sleeper (says Dr. Gregory) has become fully asleep, so as to answer questions readily without waking, there is almost always observed a remarkable change in the countenance, the manner, and the voice. On falling asleep at first, he looks perhaps drowsy and heavy, like a person dozing in church, or at table, when overcome by fatigue, or stupefied by excess in wine, or by the foul air of a crowded apartment. But when spoken to, he usually brightens up; and although the eyes be closed, yet the expression becomes highly intelligent, quite as much so as if he saw. His whole manner seems to undergo a refinement, which in the higher stages, reaches a most striking point, insomuch that we see, as it were, before us a person of a much more elevated character than the same sleeper seems to be when awake. It would seem as if the lower or animal propensities were laid to rest, while the intellect and higher sentiments shone forth with a lustre that is undiminished by aught that is mean or common. This is particularly seen in women of natural refinement and high sentiments, but it is also observed in men of the same stamp, and more or less in all. In the highest

stages of the magnetic sleep, the countenance often acquires the most lovely expression, surpassing all that the greatest artists have given to the Virgin Mary, or to Angels, and which may fitly be called heavenly, for it involuntarily suggests to our minds the moral and intellectual beauty which alone seems consistent with our views of heaven. As to the voice, I have never seen one person in the true magnetic sleep who did not speak in a tone quite distinct from the ordinary voice of the sleeper. It is invariably, so far as I have observed, softer and more gentle, well corresponding to the elevated and mild expression of the face. It has often a plaintive and touching character, especially when the sleeper speaks of departed friends or relations. In the highest stages, it has a character quite new, and in perfect accordance with the pure and lovely smile of the countenance, which beams on the observer, in spite of the closed eyes, like a ray of heaven's own light and beauty. I speak here of that which I have often seen, and I would say that, as a general rule, the sleeper, when in his ordinary state, and when in the deep magnetic sleep, appears not like the same, but like two different individuals."

4. The sleeper has a consciousness distinct from his ordinary consciousness, generally, *but not always*, forgetting when awake what took place during his sleep.

"5. The sleeper, with closed eyes, yet often speaks as if he saw certain objects, when his attention is directed to them. He even makes an apparent effort to see, or to look at them, while his eyes are only more firmly closed. But he very often feels them in his hand; and whether by the acuteness of his touch, or by some other means, describes them as if he saw them. Or he places them on his forehead, on the summit of his head, or on the occiput, or on the epigastrium, and then describes them, which perhaps he could not do when they were held by the operator before his closed eyes. He talks of seeing them, and evidently makes an exertion to apply his internal or cerebral vision to their examination. In this he often succeeds, but often also finds great difficulty, especially in the earlier stages of the sleep. In fact, we have here the dawning of clairvoyance, which only reaches its noon-day brightness in the highest stage of the sleep. In the stage to which at present our remarks are confined, the object must be in some way in contact with, or at least very close to, the sleeper; he is incapable otherwise of describing it."

6. The sleeper is very often deaf to every sound, save the voice of the operator. "I have seen subjects (says Dr. Gregory) who readily heard and answered every question addressed to them by any of the persons present, without

being in contact with them, or being purposely placed *en rapport* with them. In some of these cases, the subjects, either spontaneously, or at the will of the operator, or by passes, &c. made by him, pass into a higher state, and then instantly become deaf to all sounds, except his voice. Nay, I have seen and examined one very remarkable case, in which the sleeper, when she had passed spontaneously into a higher state of lucidity, became deaf even to the operator's voice, unless he spoke to her through the tips of her fingers, holding his mouth, while speaking, so as to touch them. When this was done she started, and, after a moment, answered questions thus put as readily as before. You might bellow in her ear, or fire off a pistol, without her countenance indicating the slightest change, or without her ceasing for an instant to dwell on and describe what she was engaged in looking at, which she readily did without questions being asked at all. Any one else could converse with this subject in the same way, and I did so for an hour or two.

" 7. The sleeper often becomes entirely insensible to pain; that is, he is rendered insensible to impressions of touch and other forms of feeling, as he was before to sounds. In many cases, where this does not spontaneously happen, but not in all, it may be effected by the will, expressed or silent, of the operator. Many persons who produce the sleep are not aware of this, and hence imagine that their subjects cannot be rendered insensible to pain.

" 8. The sleeper is usually very much under the control of the operator in reference to the duration of the sleep. The operator may fix any time, long or short, and if the sleeper promise to sleep for that period, he will do so to a second. He then wakes up, and is instantly quite free from all effect, without any further process. . . . But if no time be fixed by the operator, the sleeper awakes spontaneously, after a longer or shorter interval, generally from half an hour to two hours, at least in the cases I have seen. Sometimes, and especially if urged with many questions requiring exertion to answer, the sleeper declares that he is fatigued, and begs to be awakened.

" 9. Whether the time of sleeping be fixed by the operator, or left to nature, the sleeper, in a large number of cases, can tell when asked, and generally very readily, precisely how long he has to sleep; and if he be repeatedly asked at different times, he will always be found correct as to the time still remaining.

" 10. The sleeper, often when he is first put to sleep, and still oftener after several times, will answer a variety of ques-

tions as to the best and most effectual method of magnetising him, whether by passes or otherwise; as to the powers which he will hereafter possess; and as to the time when he shall acquire those powers, or exhibit certain phenomena.

“ 11. Although the sleeper, in general, has no recollection when awake of what has passed in the sleep, this is far from being an uniform occurrence. Some remember a part, others the whole, of what has taken place. But even in many of those cases in which there is, naturally, no remembrance of it, the operator, if he choose, may command his subject, during the sleep, to remember a part or the whole of what has occurred, which will then be remembered accordingly.

“ 12. That the subject, while asleep, may be made to forget any thing that he would otherwise remember, by the will of the operator. He may be made to forget, not only what has happened in the former sleeps, but even that he has ever slept, or been magnetised before. He often forgets spontaneously his own name, and if not, can be made to do so. This is another proof of the control exercised by the magnetiser on his subject.

“ 13. This control is further shewn by the power which the operator has of producing in the sleeper inability to move the arm or leg, to speak, to rise up or to sit down, by his will. It is shewn in the production of partial or general cataleptic rigidity and its removal. It is shewn, in short, in the complete command of all the voluntary muscles of the subject acquired by the operator.

“ 14. It further appears in the power of causing the sleeper instantaneously to imitate, with the most perfect and admirable mimicry, every gesture of the operator, and every tone of his voice. If the magnetiser speaks German or Italian, languages perhaps quite unknown to the subject, and with the greatest rapidity, the sleeper will speak after him so exactly, that it is often impossible, when his ear is acute in catching the minute shades of sound, to perceive the slightest difference. If the magnetiser laughs, he instantly laughs; if the former makes any gesture, however ridiculous, the latter imitates it exactly, and all this with closed eyes, and when the operator is behind him, so that he cannot be seen. The same subject when awake, will often, indeed generally, be found to fail miserably in his attempts at this instantaneous mimicry, and indeed to fail even when he takes more time to it.

“ 15. The sleeper, if naturally insensible to the voice or to the actions of all but his magnetiser, may be put *en rapport* with any other person. This may be done by simply giving him the person's hand, in many cases. In others, the sleeper

requires to be told to communicate with that person, and this having been done, he becomes as completely and exclusively *en rapport* with him as he before was with the magnetiser. It often happens, that the stranger thus placed *en rapport* with the subject, must again retransfer him to the magnetiser, before the latter can communicate with him. The transference from one to another, in such cases, is usually attended with a start on the part of the sleeper, but he does not awake.

“ 16. All the feelings, propensities, and talents of the sleeper may be excited to action by the magnetiser, and that in various ways, either by merely touching the corresponding parts of the head, as in what is called phreno-mesmerism, to be hereafter considered, or, as comes naturally to be considered in this place, by the expressed will of the operator.

“ The subject may be rendered happy and gay, or sad and dejected; angry, or pleased; liberal, or stingy; proud, or vain; pugnacious, or pacific; bold, or timid; hopeful, or despondent; insolent, or respectful, &c. &c. He may be made to sing, to spout, to laugh, to weep, to act, to dance, to shoot, to fish, to preach, to pray, to deliver an eloquent oration, or to excogitate a profound argument.”

17. The sleeper is usually peculiarly sensitive to the effects of music, and much more so than in his ordinary state.

“ 18. Not only are the attitudes and gesture, the tone of voice and the expression of the face, true to nature, in the expression of every feeling that is excited, but this truthfulness extends to all that is said by the sleeper. As a general, perhaps invariable rule, he refuses, whatever questions may be asked, or suggestions made, to go beyond what he feels sure of, in describing his own sensations, or his visions, if we call them so. The spectator often unconsciously does his best to mislead him by leading questions, and also by such as arise from a misconception of his meaning. Yet of all things observed in the sleep, that which most constantly recurs, and most forcibly strikes us, is the frequent repetition of the words, ‘ I don’t know exactly;’ ‘ I cannot say for certain;’ ‘ I cannot see whether it is so or not;’ ‘ I must not say what I do not see, or feel, or know,’ and the like; while, when the sleeper once sees, feels, or knows a thing, he adheres firmly to it.”

19. After once producing the sleep on a subject, the operator can produce it afterwards with much greater ease on the same person, at times being able to cause its instantaneous production by the mere act of his will, even at a great distance. Of this phenomenon, Dr. Gregory gives the following instance:

“ Mr. Lewis met a party of fifty ladies and gentlemen in my house, one evening in the end of November or beginning of December 1850. He acted on the company *en masse*, and affected several, among them a lady, a member of my family, who was susceptible, and had frequently been magnetised by others. This lady, when magnetised, loses the power of her arms, her eyes are closed, and the sensations she experiences are very marked and well known to her. Mr. Lewis, not being told how strongly she had been affected by him, did not do any thing to remove the effect, and the consequence was a headache, to which she is naturally very subject. This she ascribed to her not having been demagnetised, and it continued next morning. When I saw Mr. Lewis, after my lecture, at 11 A.M., he asked me how the lady was. I mentioned the headache, as well as her idea of the cause of it. Mr. Lewis then said, ‘ Oh, never mind the headache. I shall think of her sometime during the day, and dismiss her headache.’ This I begged him to do, as I knew that such things could be done. He then left me. When I returned home, at 5 P.M., I had quite forgotten this conversation, when the lady in question recalled it by saying, as I entered the room, ‘ What do you think of this? I have been magnetised in your absence.’ ‘ Indeed! by whom?’ ‘ By nobody. I was sitting at the pianoforte playing, at half-past three, when I felt as if strongly magnetised; my arms lost their power; I could no longer play, and had all the usual sensations. In a few minutes I was compelled to lie down on the sofa, and fell into a short magnetic sleep. When I woke, my headache was quite gone.’ ‘ Did you mention this to any one at the time?’ ‘ I was alone; but, just as I woke, a lady, who was here last night, called, and I told her of it, adding, that I felt sure that Mr. Lewis was magnetising me.’ I then said that he had undertaken to do so, but that I did not know whether he had done it or not. In the evening I saw Mr. Lewis again, at a large party, and, in the presence of Dr. W. F. Cumming, who felt much interested in the case, I asked him whether he had kept his promise about the lady’s headache. He said he had. Dr. Cumming then asked him at what time, when he at once answered, ‘ At half-past three, when I returned to my lodgings. I could not do it sooner.’

“ It appears to me that every thing was here combined to make the case a good one. It was accidental. The subject had no idea either that she was to be magnetised, nor of the time; and a lady came opportunely to attest the fact before my return, while a gentleman heard Mr. Lewis’ answers to my questions and his own. I may add, that the lodgings of Mr. Lewis are in South St. Andrew Street, while my house is at 114 Prince’s Street, a distance of nearly four divisions of Prince’s Street, or, I should suppose, 500 or 600 yards. I may further state, that on two other occasions, Mr. Lewis affected the same lady, at the same and at a greater distance, without her knowing that he was to do so.”

We may here add, that we ourselves know of a precisely

similar case, in which the operator was the wife of a gentleman whose name is well known to all our readers, and who, with his wife, has since become a Catholic.

20. "Not only may (says Dr. Gregory) the subject be put to sleep by the silent will, but he may be made, also by the silent will, to exhibit all the phenomena already described as producible by the expressed volition of the operator. He may be made, in this way, to come to the operator, or to sit down in any place, or to perform any act, which the magnetiser may will him to do. It is unnecessary here to repeat details; it suffices to say, that, in many cases, every thing that can be done by the expressed will, may be done also by the silent will, of the latter. This, too, occurs also in the conscious state.

21. "Another remarkable fact, is a kind of attraction felt towards the magnetiser, and which he, by willing, can exert in many cases. The subject then feels an irresistible desire to approach him, and if prevented will exert great force to overcome the obstacle. He cannot explain it farther than by saying that he is drawn somehow towards him; some, however, speak of fine filaments or threads, often luminous, by which they are gently drawn to him. This strange attraction may also be exhibited at a distance. I have been informed, on the best authority, of a case where it was exerted at the distance of 100 yards or more, and where the subject moved towards the operator, till stopped by the wall of the house in which she was, in spite of the resistance offered by a strong man. This may also be shewn in the conscious state.

22. "In some cases, there is observed a permanent liking for the magnetiser, in the ordinary waking state of the subject. I have not had opportunities of seeing this; but it is, I believe, a well-authenticated fact.

23. "This leads me to another very curious phenomenon, namely, that the sleeper, if commanded, in the sleep, to do a certain thing, after waking, and at a certain hour, will do so, and however absurd or ridiculous the act, he cannot, in many cases, refrain from doing it, if he has promised it in the sleep. He may have been ordered to go to a certain person's house at a certain hour, and ask some trifling or useless question. As the time approaches, he is seen to be restless, till he sets out for his destination. He pays no attention to the people he may meet, and if they purposely arrest him, he forces his way onwards, asks his question, and can only say, that he felt that he *must* do so. He is often much hurt at the ridicule excited by his action, and therefore should not be made to

do any thing that may excite ridicule, as, if that be persevered in, he will refuse compliance with the order or request, when made. This, at least, often happens.

"This power, of influencing the waking actions by a promise made in the sleep, may be most usefully applied. I lately saw a person, who had been induced by Mr. Lewis to promise, while in the sleep, to abstain from fermented liquors, and had, in his ordinary state, steadily adhered to that promise, ever since it was made, three or four months before; nor had he the slightest desire to break it. I do not know whether he was aware of having made the promise, but that is not at all essential. The desire is extinguished, even when the subject has no recollection of the promise, and has not been told of it in his waking state. Mr. Lewis informs me that he has broken many persons off the habit of drinking, as well as of other bad habits in this way. From what I have seen, I am satisfied that a pledge given in the magnetic sleep will be found more binding than one given in the ordinary waking state."

Such are the chief of what are called the lower phenomena of the magnetic sleep. In comparison with the higher phenomena they seem everyday trifles. These latter are defined as of two classes, viz. sympathy and clairvoyance. In the cases of sympathy, the sleeper acquires the power of perceiving every sensation, bodily and mental, of his magnetiser. Thus, there is produced a community of taste. "If the operator, or other person *en rapport* with the subject, takes any kind of food or drink into his mouth, the sleeper, in many cases, instantly begins going through the pantomime of eating or drinking; and if asked, he declares he is eating bread, or an orange, or sweetmeats, or drinking water, wine, milk, beer, syrup, or lemonade, or infusion of wormwood, or brandy, or whisky, according as the operator takes each of them, or any other substance. When the thing taken is bitter or disagreeable, the countenance of the sleeper at once indicates this, while his eyes, as usual, are closed, and the magnetiser or friend may stand behind him, so that he cannot see what is taken." The same results take place in the action of the senses of smell and touch. With respect to the sight and the hearing Dr. Gregory hesitates to pronounce.

Between the conditions of clairvoyance and sympathy there exists a species of compound state, termed sympathetic clairvoyance, or thought-reading.

"Thought-reading (as Dr. Gregory describes it) presents itself in every possible variety of form. The sleeper, being placed *en rapport* with any person, can often describe, with the greatest ac-

curacy, the subject that occupies the thoughts of that person. It may be an absent friend, or his own house, or that of another, or his drawing-room, bed-room, study, &c. &c. All these things the sleeper perceives, as they pass through the mind of the experimenter, and describes with great minuteness and accuracy, so as to excite our astonishment. Or he goes further; he not only perceives the present, but the past thoughts of the person *en rapport* with him; he shares his memory. Thus he will mention facts, no longer so existing, but remembered by the experimenter. Nay, he goes still further even than this; for he perceives things once known to, and now forgotten by, the experimenter, who very often contradicts the sleeper, and persists in maintaining his own opinion, until, on further inquiry, he not only finds him to be right, but himself is enabled to recal the fact, which had, as we say, escaped his memory. We all know that we are apt, at times, to forget facts, which subsequently recur to the memory. But here, it would seem that the sleeper so sympathises with our past thoughts, as to read what we ourselves are for the moment blind to. At least, this must be admitted by those who ascribe all clairvoyance to sympathy; but it is difficult, in many cases, to distinguish between sympathetic and direct clairvoyance, if we admit the possibility of the latter. For example, the sleeper describes a room, at the request of the experimenter. He details the form, size, doors, windows, book-cases, tables, carpet, fireplace, sofas, chairs, pianoforte, &c. &c., and, as he goes on, every statement is confirmed by the proprietor, who sees the whole in his mind's eye, as when he left it. But all at once, perhaps, the sleeper speaks of the hangings, or pictures, and says he sees the picture of a dog, a horse, or a man, in such or such a position, with reference to another object. This is denied; but the sleeper is firm. So is the other, and after a long dispute, each retains his opinion. But on returning home, the experimenter finds that he has been mistaken, and the sleeper right. He now remembers, that up to a certain period, the picture hung where he had said, but that he himself, or some one else, had changed its position to that described by the sleeper, as he himself formerly knew, but had forgotten. Similar occurrences are very common. . . .

“One frequent form of thought-reading is that of perceiving the contents of a closed letter, or of a sealed packet, or of a sealed box. Some sleepers can do this readily, if *en rapport* with a person who knows these contents, but not otherwise. But here it must be noted, that, in some cases, the *rappport* is established without contact, so that it suffices for the sleeper, that one person who knows the contents of the closed objects should be present. And lastly, it appears that some subjects, who at one time possess the power of direct or immediate clairvoyance, at other times are destitute of this, and have only that of thought-reading.”

The powers of direct clairvoyance are more marvellous still. The sleeper sees objects of every kind, before him,

behind him, hidden in persons' hands, shut up in boxes, on the other side of house-walls, in houses far distant, even to the other side of the Atlantic ocean. He visits in mind distant places, and describes every thing that is going on there. He can see events long past, and describe the details of the history of persons long dead. He can look into his own body and into the bodies of others, and describes with the utmost minuteness their anatomical structure. In addition to these powers, it is asserted by some persons that the clairvoyant state occasionally enables persons to foretel future events. Dr. Gregory admits that he has never himself known an instance of the kind, except such as were immediately and *organically* connected with the present condition of the subject of the prophecy.

Lastly, it is stated that the magnetic influence is exerted not merely by one person over another, but by magnets, by certain crystals, by the moon, by electricity, and perhaps by every substance in nature. It is also said that a faint light is frequently *visible*, emanating from the magnetising body, whether an inanimate object or the hand of an operator.

We proceed to give a few of the very numerous cases cited by Dr. Gregory.

The first shews the effects of suggestion in the conscious state, in which the patient remains awake, but changes his sensations, and has his various powers absolutely controlled at the will of the operator.

“ In a large party at my house (says Dr. Gregory), Mr. Lewis acted on the company *en masse*, standing at one end of the room, while all present were requested to gaze at him, or at any fixed point in the same direction, and to keep themselves in as passive a state as possible. Mr. Lewis gazed on the company, beginning at one end of the circle of fifty persons, and slowly carrying his gaze round, with the most intense concentration I have ever seen, as expressed in his face, attitude, and gesture. In much less than five minutes, although the necessary silence was but partially observed, several persons were distinctly affected. Among these, Mr. D., a student of medicine, very soon appeared to be the most susceptible. Mr. Lewis, observing this, directed his attention more particularly to him, and made a few distant passes, gradually approaching Mr. D. The latter bent forward with fixed insensible eyes and heaving respiration, and seemed to be attracted towards the operator. It soon appeared, however, that he was so rigid as not to be able to move forward, although he evidently tried to do so. Mr. Lewis then came near, and, by a pass or two, stopped the laborious respirations, and removed the general rigidity, when the eyes became natural. Mr. D. was then made to close his eyes, and on being told he could not open them, he found it impossible to do

so. His mouth being closed, he was then told he could not open it, nor speak, and this also he found impossible. His right arm being raised, Mr. Lewis, who had not touched him, told him that he could not lower it, which proved to be the case. It very soon became hard, rigid, and immovable, and was held out horizontally for a long time. In fact, a pass or two, over any limb, rendered it instantly rigid. Mr. Lewis then desired Mr. D. to gaze at him for a second or two, he gazing in return; when the eyes at once became fixed, the pupil dilated, and utterly insensible, so that no contraction ensued when a candle was passed close across the eye, or held close before it. The pulse being 76, Mr. Lewis pointed with one hand over the heart, while a medical man felt the pulse. It rapidly rose to 150, and became so feeble as hardly to be felt, while the patient became pale, and would certainly have fainted, had this experiment been continued a minute longer. Mr. Lewis then caused both the arms and legs of the patient successively to move, in spite of all the efforts of the patient, according as he, Mr. L., chose to direct them. They first moved to a certain extent, and then became rigid, and all this without contact. When his hand was laid on that of Mr. L., and he was defied to remove it, he found it quite impossible to do so.

“ Mr. Lewis, having thus shewn his control over the muscles both voluntary and involuntary, next shewed his power of controlling sensation. A penknife being placed in Mr. D.’s hand, he was told that it would soon become so hot that he could not hold it. Within about two minutes he began to shift it from one part of the hand to another, and soon threw it away as if it had been red-hot. The knife was again placed in his hand, and he was told that it would become so heavy as to force his hand down to the floor. He very soon began to make efforts to keep it up, but in about three or four minutes, in spite of the most violent resistance, which caused him to be bathed in perspiration, and to be out of breath, his hand was forced down to the floor.

“ Mr. Lewis next caused Mr. D. to forget his own name, and the perplexity of his countenance, while seeking for it in vain, was very striking. In this, as in all the other experiments, the effect was instantaneously dissipated by a snap of Mr. L.’s fingers, or by the words, ‘ All right.’ ”

The next extract refers to what is called direct clairvoyance in the waking state. Dr. Gregory is quoting from the accounts given to him by the operator, Major Buckley.

“ Major Buckley first ascertains whether his subjects are susceptible, by making with his hands passes above and below their hands, from the wrist downwards. If certain sensations, such as tingling, numbness, &c. are strongly felt, he knows that he will be able to produce the magnetic sleep. But to ascertain whether he can obtain conscious clairvoyance, he makes slow passes from his own forehead to his own chest. If this produce a blue light in his

face, strongly visible, the subject will probably acquire conscious clairvoyance. If not, or if the light be pale, the subject must first be rendered clairvoyant in the sleep. Taking those subjects who see a very deep blue light, he continues to make passes over his own face, and also over the object, a box or a nut, for example, in which written or printed words are enclosed, which the clairvoyant is to read. Some subjects require only a pass or two to be made, others require many. They describe the blue light as rendering the box or nut transparent, so that they can read what is inside. (This reminds us of the curious fact mentioned by Reichenbach, that bars of iron or steel, seen by conscious sensitives, without any passes, shining in the dark with the odyllic glow, appeared to them transparent like glass.) If too many passes be made by Major B., the blue light becomes so deep that they cannot read, and some reverse passes must be made, to render the light less deep. Major Buckley has thus produced conscious clairvoyance in 89 persons, of whom 44 have been able to read mottoes contained in nut-shells, purchased by other parties for the experiment. The longest motto thus read contained 98 words. Many subjects will read motto after motto without one mistake. In this way, the mottoes contained in 4860 nut-shells have been read; some of them, indeed, by persons in the mesmeric sleep, but most of them by persons in the conscious state, many of whom have never been put to sleep. In boxes, upwards of 36,000 words have been read; in one paper, 371 words. Including those who have read words contained in boxes when in the sleep, 148 persons have thus read. It is to be observed that, in a few cases, the words may have been read by thought-reading, as the persons who put them in the boxes were present; but in most cases, no one who knew the words has been present, and they must therefore have been read by direct clairvoyance. Every precaution has been taken. The nuts, enclosing mottoes, for example, have been purchased of 40 different confectioners, and have been sealed up until read. It may be added, that of the 44 persons who have read mottoes in nuts by waking or conscious clairvoyance, 42 belong to the higher class of society; and the experiments have been made in the presence of many other persons. These experiments appear to me admirably contrived, and I can perceive no reason whatever to doubt the entire accuracy of the facts. It would of course be tedious to enumerate so many experiments, all of the same kind; but I shall select one or two of the most striking as examples.

“Case 9.—Sir T. Willshire took home with him a nest of boxes belonging to Major Buckley, and placed in the inner box a slip of paper, on which he had written a word. Some days later he brought back the boxes, sealed up in paper, and asked one of Major Buckley's clairvoyantes to read the word. Major B. made passes over the boxes, when she said she saw the word ‘concert.’ Sir T. Willshire declared that she was right as to the first and last letters, but that the word was different. She persisted, when he told her that

the word was 'correct.' But on opening the boxes, the word proved to be 'concert.' This case is very remarkable; for had the clairvoyante read the word by thought-reading, she would have read it according to the belief of Sir T. Willshire, who had either intended to write 'correct,' or in the interval, forgot that he had written 'concert,' but certainly believed the former to be the word."

It is well known that in past times it was supposed that certain persons possessed a power of describing distant occurrences by means of divination through the aid of "magic crystals" or "magic mirrors." Modern mesmerism asserts that these were mere cases of *conscious clairvoyance*, acquired by gazing steadily at some peculiar object. The following is one of Dr. Gregory's instances of the reality of this power, seen by himself and tested by himself:

"The crystal of which I speak is of the size and shape of a large turkey's egg, and was sold some years since by a dealer in curiosities as an old magic crystal, with a paper containing certain mystical and magical rules for its use. In the few experiments I shall mention, it was used by simply desiring the person to gaze earnestly at it.

"Case 13.—A boy, quite ignorant of what was expected, after gazing at the crystal for about half an hour very steadily, saw a dark cloud appear in it, which soon cleared up, and he then saw his mother in her room. By and by, his father appeared. I then asked him to look for a lady, whom he saw walking in the street in which she lived, and actually described her walking dress, which he had never seen, although he may have seen the lady for a moment in the evening. I then asked for a boy and a servant whom I was sure he had never seen. He saw and described most accurately the persons and dress of both. I asked for another servant, whom he saw opening the street-door to admit the lady. I marked the time, and found that this lady had been walking in the dress described, and had entered her house at the time when the boy had seen her."

The following case illustrates the connexion stated by mesmerists to exist between the organs of the brain (as defined by the phrenologist) and the magnetic power. Dr. Gregory gives other cases, tried by himself, with precisely similar results.

"A. F., a young man, was put to sleep by me in a few minutes. In this state, every part of the head that was tried, yielded striking manifestations of the corresponding phrenological faculty. I had no reason to think that this young man knew the positions of the organs, nor any thing about phrenology; but even if he had some general notions on the subject, the effects produced appeared so rapidly that it was impossible for him to have simulated them, even had he been disposed to do so, which I am sure was not the case. Benevolence, destructiveness, combativeness, secretiveness, acquisitiveness, self-esteem, love of approbation, veneration, cautiousness, adhesiveness, philoprogenitiveness, tune, &c., were all tried, first in rapid succes-

tion, and all yielded strong manifestations, although very often they were quite different from what I had expected, or were distinct when I had no clear idea of how they were to be manifested. Benevolence being touched, he instantly began to give away all his money to me, taking me for an object of charity; and when I continued the contact, took off his coat to give me. This is the almost universal manifestation of benevolence, obviously because, when the feeling is excited, its most natural result is to give to those in want. Cautiousness produced the most vivid picture of terror I ever saw; he said there was a fearful abyss before him, and felt as if he was to fall into it. Tune instantly caused him to sing; imitation, to imitate not only every sound he heard, but also, with closed eyes, the gestures made by those near him. It is impossible here to give all the details; suffice it to say, that although it looked like first-rate acting, a close study of his countenance shewed the most entire truthfulness. Besides, as I moved my hand from one organ to another, so rapidly as to confuse any one not very much in the habit of guessing what organ is touched, the effects never failed to follow. To test him further, I tried touching two organs at once, and invariably obtained combined manifestations. Thus when benevolence and acquisitiveness were touched, he put his hand into his pockets as before, but instead of giving me the contents, he treated me to a lecture on the heinousness of begging, and declared that he thought giving money the worst kind of charity. Veneration alone caused him to pray humbly and devoutly; veneration and self-esteem combined, gave rise to a prayer, in a standing position, in which he returned thanks for having been made so superior to other men in religious knowledge. This combination was accidental, self-esteem having been first much excited, with very amusing results, and veneration having been touched before the excitement of self-esteem had subsided, with the desire of reproducing the former humble devotion. Many similar trials yielded analogous results. I found also, that when, intending to touch one part, my hand accidentally glided to another, the manifestation was always that of the part really touched, not of that which I intended to touch. In the region of the supposed organ of alimentiveness, I found, within a small space, three different points, the touching of one of which produced excessive desire to eat, of another, the desire to drink, of the third, sensations of smell. To obtain these results, which could not be known to the subjects, since they were not then published, nor generally known to phrenologists, although I had heard of them, it was necessary only to move the point of the finger one-fourth or one-eighth of an inch, the three points certainly lying in less than the surface of a shilling. In all these trials, it did not signify what I wished, or what I said, only such organs were excited as I touched. I had complete evidence that the subject did not sympathise with me or with my thoughts, but that my touch excited the faculty corresponding to the part touched."

We next come to the sympathetic clairvoyance in the

magnetic sleep, by which the clairvoyante perceives events and facts when brought into contact with any object that has been in contact with the objects of his vision. The Dr. Haddock spoken of is a physician at Bolton, and E., the patient, is a girl under his care. Dr. Gregory thus describes some of the marvels he witnessed :

“ Before I had seen E., I sent to Dr. Haddock the writing of a lady, without any details, requesting merely to know what E. should say of it. I did not even say it was a lady's writing, and, indeed, as the hand is a strong, bold one, Dr. H. supposed it was that of a man. E. took it in her hand, she being in a sleep, and soon said, “ I see a lady. She is rather below middle height, dark complexioned, pale, and looks ill.” She then proceeded to describe the house, the drawing-room in which the lady was, her dress, and the furniture, all with perfect accuracy as far as she went. She said the lady was sitting at a long table close to the wall, something like a sideboard, writing a letter ; that on this table were several beautiful glasses, such as she had never seen. (In fact, this lady writes at a long sofa-table at the wall, on which stood then several Bohemian glasses.) She further detailed, with strict accuracy, all the symptoms of the lady's illness, mentioning several things known to the lady alone. She also described the treatment which had been followed, and said among other things, that the lady had gone over the water, to a place where she drank “ morning waters” for her health ; that the waters had a strange taste, but had done her good. (The lady had been at a mineral water in Germany, and had derived benefit from it. The water was always taken in the morning.) I need not enter into all the details ; it is enough to state, that not only Dr. H. did not know the lady, nor even her name, but that he had had no means of knowing any one of the details specified, and indeed rather supposed E. was wrong when she spoke of a lady, until he found that she was positive on that point. I received his answer, with the above and many more details, almost by return of post, and, in short, I was perfectly satisfied that E. had seen or perceived somehow, from the handwriting, all that she said, as I knew she had done in other cases.

“ 2. Some months later, I went with the same lady to visit E. She had never been told the lady's name, and was introduced to her and me as to two strangers. When she was put asleep, Dr. H. desired her to take the lady's hand. As soon as she did so, she said, “ Oh ! you are the lady I went to see.” “ Which lady ?” said Dr. H. “ Don't you remember ? The lady who sat at the table with the pretty glasses.” She then proceeded to say, that the lady had been lately again at a place, over the water, where she took morning waters, and where the people spoke gibberish ; that she was better now, but had been worse, and that a doctor had repeatedly put something down her throat, which hurt her very much. (The throat had been cauterised with lunar caustic.) She specified ex-

actly the present symptoms, and entered into various minute details concerning what she had formerly seen, many of which Dr. H. had forgot, but which, on referring to his notes, made nearly six months before, he found to be correct.

"I gave E. a letter, which Dr. H. supposed to be written by a lady. E. did not look at it, but felt it in her hand, and laid it on her head. She began to speak of a lady, who kept coming before her, but was not the writer of the letter. On the contrary, this lady prevented her from distinguishing the writer. She requested Dr. H. to remove this influence, which he did by blowing on the letter, and passing his hand briskly over it several times. She then put it on her head, and said that it was written by a little boy, whom she described very accurately, dwelling particularly on the peculiarities of his disposition, his old-fashioned ways, as she called them, his love of reading, and various other points, all more or less characteristic. His dress astonished her very much, and she described it most minutely in every part. It was the Highland dress, and she gave the colours and pattern of the tartan, as well as every other detail of the boy's dress and accoutrement. It appeared that she had never seen the Highland dress worn, and she thought it must be very cold. The boy was my own son, then in Edinburgh, and neither E. nor Dr. H. knew that I had a son, or that he wore the Highland dress. She told us that the lady she had first seen was one who was much attached to the boy, and described her accurately. This lady had charge of the boy during my absence, and his letter had been enclosed in one from her, from which it had just been taken when it was given to E. This accounted, Dr. H. told us, for her seeing the lady. When E. was asked whether she could see or discover the mother of the boy, she said that she had at first supposed the lady whose figure first came before her to be the mother, but had soon discovered that she was not. She said she would try to find her out, and would, as she said, ask the boy to tell her where his mother was. After a silence, she said, 'The mother left home some time since, and went over the water, but I cannot see her there now, although I see her marks in the place where she was. If Dr. H. will bring me back to Bolton, I shall be able to find her.' Dr. H. then, by a few manipulations, brought her back to her original magnetic state, and the boy's mother, who was present, having touched her hand, she exclaimed with surprise, 'Why, you are the mother of the little boy!'

"A nobleman of high rank, much devoted to science, found one day, among the gravel in his garden-walk, a small flint arrow-head, such as was in former ages used by the Britons, and is often called a 'celt.' This I folded in several folds of thick white blotting-paper, enclosed it in an envelope, which was sealed, and placed this in a second envelope. I then sent it to Dr. H., requesting him to ask E. to look at it, and tell us what she could about it. When given to her, the sealed envelope was enclosed in a second, and from the way in which I had folded it up, no one, out of several whom I tried, could

guess the form of the arrow-head by feeling it. E. first held it in her hand, and laid it on her head, and very soon drew an outline of the form of the object, which she said was enclosed in several folds of blotting paper, nearly white. As it was very small, only about an inch long, and very sharp at one end, E. at first took it for the tooth of some large animal. She said its colour was yellowish white, with a few dark streaks, and pointed out where the edges were chipped. On pursuing her examination, she said it could not be a tooth, as it was made of stone, and after (mentally) biting it, in doing which she merely approached the packet to her mouth, and appeared to be biting something, she declared without further hesitation that it was made of flint. Every detail she gave I found perfectly accurate, and as the packet was returned to me intact, I have no doubt that E. saw the object perfectly by direct clairvoyance. She could not, however, tell its use, but by sympathy, she went on to say, that a gentleman had found it in a gravel-walk in a garden; that he had worn it, that is, carried it, in his waistcoat pocket, (I think she said the left,) for some time; that this gentleman was a very great gentleman, and, in answer to successive questions, she gave the title appropriate to his rank. She was asked to observe more about him, and then said she saw him in a palace house; she spoke in whispers out of respect, and when her attention was drawn to the point, described the nobleman's person very correctly. This was done on a subsequent occasion, as I had requested Dr. H., when I found E. had discovered the finder of the arrow-head, to ask further questions about him. In sending the packet to Dr. H., and until I had heard all that E. had to say, I carefully avoided giving the slightest information either as to the object or the finder."

Equally amazing are the powers of *direct clairvoyance* in the magnetic sleep, as the following will shew:

"At the house (says Dr. Gregory) of Dr. Schmitz, rector of the High School here, I saw a little boy, of about nine years of age, put into the magnetic sleep by a young man of seventeen. As the boy was said to be clairvoyant, I requested him, through his magnetiser, whom alone he heard, to visit, mentally, my house, which was nearly a mile off, and perfectly unknown to him. He said he would; and soon, when asked, began to describe the back drawing-room, in which he saw a sideboard with glasses, and on the sideboard a singular apparatus, which he described. In fact, this room, although I had not told him so, is used as a dining-room, and has a sideboard, on which stood at that moment glasses, and an apparatus for preparing soda water, which I had brought from Germany, and which was then quite new in Edinburgh. I then requested him, after he had mentioned some other details, to look at the front room, in which he described two small portraits, most of the furniture, mirrors, ornamental glasses, and the position of the pianoforte, which is very unusual. Being asked whom he saw in the room, he replied, only a lady, whose dress he described, and a boy. This I ascertained to be cor-

rect at that time. As it was just possible that this might have been done by thought-reading, although I could detect no trace of any sympathy with me, I then requested Dr. Schmitz to go into another room, and there to do whatever he pleased, while we should try whether the boy could see what he did. Dr. S. took with him his son; and when the sleeper was asked to look into the other room, he began to laugh, and said that Theodore (Dr. S.'s son) was a funny boy, and was gesticulating in a particular way with his arms, while Dr. S. stood looking on. He then said that Theodore had left the room, and after a while that he had returned; then that Theodore was jumping about; and being asked about Dr. S., declined more than once to say, not liking to tell, as he said, but at last told us, that he also was jumping about. Lastly, he said Dr. S. was beating his son, not with a stick, although he saw a stick in the room, but with a roll of paper. All this did not occupy more than seven or eight minutes; and when Dr. S. returned, I at once gave him the above account of his proceedings, which he, much astonished, declared to be correct in every particular. Here, thought-reading was absolutely impossible; for neither I, nor any one present, had the least idea of what Dr. S. was to do, nor indeed had Dr. S. himself, till I suggested it, known that such an experiment was to be tried. I am, therefore, perfectly satisfied, that the boy actually saw what was done: for to suppose that he had guessed it, appears to me a great deal more wonderful; besides, his manner was entirely that of one describing what he saw. I regret much that I was unable to pursue further the investigation of this case, which would no doubt have presented many interesting phenomena. I have mentioned it as a recent one, and because Dr. Schmitz and others saw the facts, and can attest them."

These instances may be multiplied almost indefinitely both from Dr. Gregory's book and from the various publications, English and foreign, devoted to the subject of mesmerism. We can give, however, but the following cases of the powers attributed to Alexis, the well-known French clairvoyant.

"Mons. Sabine, chief of the station of the Havre railroad, went a few days ago to consult Alexis, who, when in somnambulism, said, 'You come about something lost in the service to which you belong?' 'It is true,' replied he. 'You are employed on the Havre railroad?' 'It is likewise true. (Mons. Sabine not having previously stated his business to any one.) It is a basket that is missing, containing some little animals.' 'They are——they are——leeches. You sent to inquire about the basket at Rouen and at Havre, and you have received no news of it. This is what has taken place. A traveller, going to Havre by your carriages on the——the——the 11th November, was greatly annoyed, on arriving at his destination, to find only one basket instead of two, which he had on setting off.' 'This is wonderful!' said Mons. Sabine. 'There were two baskets of leeches. The train (continued Alexis) on arriving at Rouen, left

several travellers with their luggage, and one of the baskets was, by mistake, on one of the omnibuses going into town, and the conductor was surprised to find that no one claimed it. From fear of being scolded, he did not deposit it in the baggage warehouse, but hid it for some time in his stable; and while it was there, you wrote to Rouen and Havre about it, the reply being that it could not be found. A few days ago the conductor put it in the goods dépôt, near the entrance, and beneath the first window on the right. You will find it if you set off to Rouen; only, on account of the length of time that has elapsed, you will find about 200 leeches dead.' On the next day, Mons. Sabine returned from Rouen, having found the basket at the place indicated by Alexis, with 200 of the leeches dead. The directors of the railroad expressed themselves doubly obliged to the somnambulist and his magnetism, inasmuch as the proprietor of the leeches, perceiving that they were not found after twenty-five days, had stated their value to be double what it actually was.

"In the autumn of 1845, Alexis gave a series of mesmeric *séances* to the medical men of Havre, each of whom were permitted to bring one friend to witness the experiments. One of them took with him Mr. Featherstonhaugh, the consul at Havre, who had come over the day before from California, and was a decided sceptic as to mesmerism. In order to test Alexis, Mr. Featherstonhaugh put in his pocket, enclosed in a box, a portion of a Japanese idol which he had picked up out of the wreck of a vessel from Japan, which had been lost on the coast of California during his stay there. On being asked by Mr. F., 'What have I in my pocket?' Alexis answered, 'It looks like a beetle; but it is not one, but part of a Japanese idol with an inscription on it: you picked it up during a walk on the sea-shore in California, and thought at first it was some curious stone, but you afterwards perceived it was an idol which had been washed up from the wreck of a Japanese vessel that was lost on that coast a few days before.' The relater of this was Monsieur Paravet of Havre, to whom it was told by one of the medical men present at the time.

"At a *séance* which took place before the *élite* of the society at Versailles, Dr. Bataille, one of the principal physicians of this town, placed in the hands of Alexis a letter, and requested him to describe the residence of his son, who was living at Grandville. 'Instead of giving you an account of the apartment of your son,' said Alexis, 'I am now occupied about his health, which is very bad.' 'How! bad?' replied his interrogator. 'You have in your hand his last letter, dated six days ago, in which he states himself to be very well.' 'To-morrow,' rejoined Alexis, 'you will receive a letter from his wife, announcing to you that he is very ill. I recommend you on the receipt of this to set off *immediately*, for, knowing as you do the constitution of your son, there is only you who can save him. He is very ill.' The next day the letter arrived, and Dr. Bataille immediately set off for Grandville, found his son very ill, and, after a fortnight's sojourn, succeeded in restoring him to health. On his return to Versailles, this event produced a great sensation throughout the town."

Such is this portentous power, according to the statements of those who believe in its existence. As we have already said, we do not profess to give any opinion of our own as to its reality, though we confess we do not see how the testimony on which it rests is to be got over. Supposing, however, that these astounding phenomena do take place in the mesmerised subject, how far is it morally lawful for Catholics to take any part in acts which (to say the least) involve consequences of so strange and perilous a character? Many persons, we know, Catholics as well as Protestants, are disposed to throw the whole question overboard at once, by attributing the mesmeric phenomena to the direct agency of the devil. For ourselves, we confess that we have never either heard or read any thing which induces us to accept such an explanation of the marvels of the magnetic state. They appear to us to be the results—(supposing them of course to be true as facts)—of some hitherto unknown and totally incomprehensible natural medium, by which the mind when thrown into a morbid state, possesses powers unknown to it in its healthy condition. To say that such a purely natural and physical medium *cannot* exist, and that therefore the magnetic state *must* be supernatural and diabolic, is wholly incompatible with a belief in the omnipotence of God himself. It is idle to say that we necessarily know already so much of the laws of the universe as to be enabled to say that the magnetic clairvoyance is naturally impossible. *How* do birds migrate, carrier-pigeons return to their homes, and dogs when carried hundreds of miles shut up in baskets find their way back to the place whence they started? By instinct, it is replied. Undoubtedly; but *what* is instinct? To a person born blind, sight appears incomprehensible; and the laws of sound to the deaf verge on the incredible. To treat magnetism as scientifically absurd or impossible, appears to us the shallowest of evasions. That it may be, and is, employed by the devil for his own objects is likely enough. Of all natural instruments for the attainment of his accursed ends, we can hardly conceive any other so frightfully adapted to satanic purposes. But that mesmerism should be made use of by the devil, no more proves that it is purely diabolic in its nature, than his abuse of the Bible proves the word of God to be satanic in its origin.

On the hypothesis, then, that the alleged facts are generally or substantially true, and granting that the mesmeric is a purely natural, though diseased and abnormal state, can a Christian, consistently with his duty to God and man, in any way employ magnetism for ends in themselves lawful? The question has already been answered three separate times by the

Holy Office, which we need not inform our Catholic readers is the recognised Church tribunal for determining doubtful cases of doctrine and morals, subject of course to the supreme authority by which that tribunal itself exists and acts.

The following are the questions which have been proposed, and the answers respectively given to them :

DE MAGNETISMO ANIMALI.

N.N. supplie V.S. autant pour l'instruction et la direction de sa conscience, que pour la direction des âmes, de daigner lui apprendre, s'il est licite que des pénitens puissent être participans aux opérations du magnétisme.

*Decretum Congregationis S. Officii, Feria III. loco IV.,
23 June, 1840.*

In Congregatione Generali S.R. Universalis Inquisitionis habita in Conventu S. Mariæ supra Minervam coram EE. ac RR. DD. S.R.E. Cardinalibus, &c.; proposita supradicta instantia, iidem EE. ac RR. DD. dixerunt: Consulat probatos auctores, cum hac advertentia, quod remoto omni errore, sortilegio, explicita aut implicita dæmonis invocatione, merus actus, adhibendi media physica aliunde licita, non est moraliter vetitus, dummodo non tendat ad finem illicitum aut quomodocumque pravum. Applicatio autem principiorum et mediorum pure physicorum ad res aut effectus vere supernaturales ut physicè explicentur, non est nisi deceptio omnino illicita et hæreticalis.

Annali delle Scienze Religiose, vol. xii. No. 36, p. 417.

Quesito proposto alla S. Inquisizione.

Nelle operazioni magnetiche scorgendosi una prossima occasione alla miscredenza ed al mal costume, si bramarebbe per tranquillità delle coscienze, conoscere quale sia a tale riguardo la vera opinione della Santa Sede.

Non si ignora la risposta già emessa dalla Congregazione del S. Officio, ma sarebbe a desiderarsi che si ottenesse dalla S. Sede una norma più determinata e più particolarizzata su questa materia.

Qualunque possa essere la convinzione individuale sopra i fatti accennati e tutti da gravi e religiosi autori, appartenendo però alla Santa madre Chiesa il giudicare e decidere in simili cose che sono di tanta importanza per la religione e per la pubblica morale, importerebbe estremamente conseguire se non formali decisioni, una norma almeno a cui possano attenersi i governi cattolici, chiamati quali essi sona da Dio a tutelare

la religione e a dar leggi per tenere in freno i pubblici costumi vegliando al loro eseguimento.

Risposta della S. Inquisizione, Feria iv. die 21 Aprilis, 1841.

In Congregatione Generali S.R. et Universalis Inquisitionis habita in Conventu S. Mariæ supra Minervam coram EE. et RR. DD. S.R.E. Cardinalibus contra hæreticam pravitatem generalibus inquisitoribus, proposita supradicta instantia, iidem EE. et RR. DD. dixerunt: Usus magnetismi prout exponitur non licere.

Eadem die, et Feria.

Sanctissimus D.N.D. Gregorius div. prov. PP. XVI., in solita audientia R.P.D. Assessori S. Officio impertita, audita suprascripta relatione, resolutionem EE. ac RR. DD. Cardinalium approbavit.

ANGELUS ARGENTI,
S.R. Univ. Inq. Notarius.

Annali delle Scienze Religiose, vol. xiii. No. 37, p. 105.

Nuovi quesiti proposti alla S. Penitenzieria intorno al Magnetismo Animale.

Eminentissime DD.,—Cum hactenus responsa circa *magnetismum animale* minime sufficere videantur, sitque magnopere optandum ut tutius magisque uniformiter solvi queant casus non raro incidentes; infra signatus Eminentiae Vestrae humiliter sequentia exponit.

Persona magnetisata quæ plerumque sexus est foeminei, in eum statum soporis ingreditur, dictum *somnambulismum magneticum*, tam alte ut nec maximus fragor ad ejus aures, nec ferri ignisve ulla vehementia illam suscitare valeant. Ab solo magnetisatore cui consensum suum dedit (consensus enim est necessarius,) ad illud extasis genus adducitur, sive variis palpitationibus gesticulationibusve, quando ille adest, sive simplici mandato eodemque interno, cum vel pluribus lencis distat.

Tunc viva voce seu mentaliter de suo absentiumque, penitus ignotorum sibi, morbo interrogata, hæc persona evidenter indocta illico medicos scientia longe superat; res anatomicas accuratissime enuntiat, morborum internorum in humano corpore, qui cognitu, definituque peritis difficillimi sunt, causam, sedem, naturam indigitat; eorundem progressus, variationes, complicationes evolvit, idque propriis terminis; sæpe etiam dictorum morborum diuturnitatem exacte prænuntiat, remediaque simplicissima et efficacissima præcipit.

Si adest persona de qua magnetisata mulier consulitur, re-

lationem inter utramque per contactum instituit magnetisator. Cum vero abest, cincinnus ex ejus cæsarie eam supplet ac sufficit. Hoc enim cincinno tantum ad palmam magnetistæ admoto, confestim hæc declarare quid sit (quin aspiciat oculis) cujus sunt capilli, ubinam versetur nunc persona ad quam pertinent, quid rerum agat; circaque ejus morbum omnia supradicta documenta ministrare, haud aliter atque si, medicorum more, corpus ipsa introspiceret.

Postremo magnetista non oculis cernit. Ipsis velatis, quidquid erit, illud leget legendi nescia, seu librum seu manuscriptum, vel apertum vel clausum, suo capiti vel ventri impositum. Etiam ex hac regione ejus verba egredi videntur. Hoc autem statu educta, vel ad jussum etiam internum magnetisantis, vel quasi sponte sua, ipso temporis puncto a se prænuntiato, nihil omnino de rebus in paroxysmo peractis sibi conscire videtur, quantumvis ille duraverit; quænam ab ipsa petita fuerint, quæ vero responderit, quæ pertulerit, hæc omnia nullam in ejus intellectu ideam, nec minimum in memoria vestigium reliquerunt.

Itaque, orator infra scriptus, tam validas cernens rationes dubitandi an simpliciter naturales sint tales effectus, quorum occasionalis causa tam parum cum eis proportionata demonstratur, enixe vehementissimeque Vestram Eminentiam rogat, ut ipsa, pro sua sapientia, ad majorem Omnipotentis gloriam, nec non ad majus animarum bonum, quæ a Domino redemptæ tanti constiterunt, decernere velit, an, posita præfatorum veritate, confessarius parochusve tuto possit pœnitentibus aut parochianis suis permittere:

1. Ut magnetismum animale, illis characteribus aliisque similibus præditum exerceant, tamquam artem medicinæ auxiliatricem atque suppletoriam.

2. Ut sese illum in statum somnambulismi magnetici demittendos consentiant.

3. Ut vel de se, vel de aliis personas consulant illo modo magnetisatas.

4. Ut unum de tribus prædictis suscipiant, habita prius cautela formaliter ex animo renuntiandi cuilibet diabolico pacto explicito vel implicito, omni etiam satanicæ interventioni, quoniam hac non obstante cautione, a nonnullis ex magnetismo hujusmodo vel iidem vel aliquot effectus obtenti jam fuerunt.

Eminentissime Domine, Eminentiae Vestræ, de mandato Reverendissimi Episcopi Lausanensis et Genevensis, humilissimus obsequentissimusque servus.

JAC. XAVERIUS FONTANA, *Can. Cancell. Episc.*

Friburgi Helvetiæ, ex ædibus episcopalibus, die 19 Maii, 1841.

Risposta della S. Penitenzieria.

Sacra Pœnitentiaria mature perpensis expositis respondendum censet prout respondet : Usus magnetismi prout in casu exponitur, non licere.

Datum Romæ in S. Pœnitentiaria die 1 Julii, 1841.

C. CARD. CASTRACANE, M.P.

Ph. Pomella, S.P. Secretarius.

From the above it will be seen, that while the Holy Office has expressed no opinion as to the reality or the falsehood of the statements of the Mesmerists, nor as to its nature and origin on the supposition of its truth, it recognises the lawfulness of the employment of *any* purely physical instrumentality, however newly discovered or marvellous, provided it be employed for purposes entirely lawful, and provided it be not a proximate occasion for sin, or in any way morally perilous in its results. This we take to be the fair deduction from the above replies. At the same time, as the above facts stand, the employment of animal magnetism, even for medical purposes, would seem to be absolutely prohibited.

And to those who for any reasons may be disposed to question the wisdom of this prohibition, we offer the following suggestions, which appear to us of such immense weight, that, even supposing no Church authority had spoken on the question, we can hardly imagine a religious person informed on the facts of the case, unless grievously ignorant, grievously incapable of reasoning, or grievously blinded by a passionate curiosity, suffering himself to be mesmerised, or himself mesmerising others.

Every man being answerable to Almighty God for all his actions, it is unlawful for any person to place himself under the control of another to the extent involved in the magnetic sleep. If the accounts we read and hear are not the grossest of fabrications, the operator possesses a power over the magnetised which it is perfectly awful to contemplate. Here is Dr. Gregory, with a host of others, declaring that, again and again, almost by the mere exertion of their wills, they can make a fellow-creature, *whether man or woman*, leap, dance, sing, converse, rush towards them, follow them, and, without a single exception, submit to their commands and desires. They can make them feel and think precisely as they please, throwing them by a look or a touch into an ecstasy of passion, of love, of hate, of gratitude, of anger, almost of madness. More than this, Dr. Gregory expressly declares that a magnetised person sometimes finds himself compelled, by an irresistible force, to

perform when awake the promises he had made during his magnetic sleep. Conceive, then, any thing more frightful than such a control over a fellow-creature's actions in the hands of *any* man. The mind shudders at the thought of the enormities that might be committed by such an instrumentality. Dr. Gregory answers the natural horror felt at such a power, by telling us that magnetism, as a matter of fact, is rarely abused. He grants, therefore, that not only it *may be* abused, but that it *is* abused. But, we ask, is it not certain that the worst enormities would be concealed? Is it to be tolerated that such a boundless facility for crime of every kind should be placed in the hands of *any* person, however upright and religious, and much more in the hands of the immense majority of mankind, human nature being what it is?

And be it remembered that when a person has once succeeded in throwing another into the magnetic sleep, or even made any progress towards so doing, there is no means of putting an end to the power thus once attained. At any moment, at any place, when far away from us, it may turn out that he can exercise the same mysterious influence. Can it be right then, we say, for the sake of some *possible* improvement in the bodily health, thus to place ourselves under the dominion of any human being? I am once magnetised in the hope of being cured of my headache, or rheumatism, or some other ailment: from that moment, for all I can tell, *by the statement of the mesmerists themselves*, I *may be* practically the slave of another. Is this endurable? is it compatible with my present happiness, with my responsibility to Almighty God?

But what shall we say to the phenomena of clairvoyance? Let the reader realise the fact, that at the very moment he is reading these lines, it is possible that in some other room, or house, or town, all his actions and thoughts are being minutely described by a magnetised girl who possesses the power of clairvoyance. Yes; start, exclaim, be amazed, as we may; unless the innumerable statements of so many unimpeachable witnesses are absolute falsehoods, there is no secret which can be kept from the knowledge of the clairvoyant. The whole framework of society is shattered. The most sacred of documents are laid open for the inspection of the impertinent and the malignant. Doors and walls form no longer a barrier against the eyes of the inquisitive, the mischievous, and the debased. Secrets on which depends the happiness of individuals and families are discovered at the bidding of a chance inquirer or of a bitter foe. Either, we repeat, the whole phenomena of clairvoyance are gross fabrications, and the testimony of an immense number of the most upright of persons is to be

treated as a falsehood, or the exercise of the powers of clairvoyance is to be forbidden as an outrage on all the laws of honour and decency.

Many of our readers will themselves be able to confirm what is said *by what they themselves have witnessed*; and they will join with us, if they are Catholics, in thanking God for having given us an authority which has a right to enact laws for our guidance, and which thus saves us from yielding to the dictates of a morbid curiosity, and tampering with a power which cannot be employed without running a risk of a violation of all that is most sacred and most dear.

SHORT NOTICES.

FATHER NEWMAN'S *Lectures on the Position of Catholics in England* (Burns and Lambert) are now completed, with a brilliancy and power which has more than sustained the promise of their opening. We hope to review them at length in our next Number. What effect they will produce time will shew; but in the mean time we cannot help pointing to an article in the *Times* newspaper of the 9th of September, which affords as curious an illustration of the cunning with which Satan uses his instruments and blinds his followers as any we remember to have met with. In the *Times* of the 8th of September appeared a clumsy and garbled report of the Catholic meeting held at Birmingham on the previous Saturday, to thank Father Newman for his lectures. A few days before, the *Times* had given a professed review of Father Newman's *Discourses to Mixed Congregations*, in which the writer had violently attacked and misrepresented one of the masterpieces in the volume, the sermon on the "Mysteries of Nature and Grace," carefully ignoring all the rest of the discourses.

Now mark the subtlety of the enemy of the Church of God. In the article commenting on the Birmingham proceedings, he makes his tool tell the world that the meeting was held *for the purpose of applauding this very sermon on the Mysteries of Nature and Grace*; and at the same time he repeats his previous calumny, that Father Newman had declared "that the existence of a Deity, or of right and wrong, rests on no better evidence than the most questionable legend of the most apocryphal saint in the Roman Calendar!" Father Newman's argument was this; that as, in spite of certain unfathomed mysteries or *difficulties* (as they appear to our feeble intellect), we all believe in the existence of Almighty God and of a moral law, so we are bound to believe in the Catholic

religion, because it rests on the same kind of proofs, and is accompanied with no greater difficulties. Then comes the devil, catches up his words, and informs the English public that Father Newman asserts that *little* as is the proof of Catholicism, and *overwhelming* the difficulties against it, the proof of God's existence is no better! "You believe in God," says Father Newman, "*therefore* believe in the Catholic religion:" "You disbelieve in Catholicism," the devil makes him argue, "*therefore* disbelieve in God." Oh! plausible, ingenious, infernal subtlety! How truly is the author of man's ruin termed the Father of Lies and a *Deceiver*! Yet the chief instrument of this enemy of God and his saints is the idol of the great English people! However, Almighty God can employ even the *Times* for the conversion of souls, and we do not doubt that in this instance it has overshot its mark, and has helped in the circulation of Father Newman's writings.

The authoress of "*Geraldine*" has essayed a bold flight in her poem, *St. Mary and her Times*" (Dolman), in fourteen cantos. Perfect success in handling such a subject in verse is perhaps scarcely attainable. From its date—"Rome, 1846"—it appears that the poem was written some years ago, though only now published. It is designed to give a narrative of such events in the life of our Blessed Lady as are recorded in Holy Scripture, by tradition, in the writings of the Fathers, and in those revelations to different saints, which have been proposed by the Church to the pious consideration of her children.

Mr. Maccabe has edited, with a very important preface, a curious pamphlet, called *A True Account of the Hungarian Revolution, by an American Democrat* (Richardson), which we recommend to the study of all who believe in Hungarianism, more especially the twenty-eight points in which the writer sums up his statements, at pp. 135-138.

The Catholic Church and the Holy Bible—Protestantism and its Variations: Choose which you will (Stutter, York), is an ingeniously executed broadsheet, fulfilling the promise of its title, which will be found useful for hanging up, to make Protestants do what they are so little inclined to—*think*.

The annual circular of a very useful institution, *St. James's Dispensary, Spanish Place, London*, contains a brief appeal from the resident clergy to their flock, which we trust will be gladly responded to.

Correspondence.

[WE have received many communications on the subject of the letters containing queries for solution, which have appeared in the last few Numbers of the *Rambler*, expressing very conflicting opinions as to the judiciousness of inserting them in a journal read by all kinds of persons. It is difficult to decide on a subject where judgments entitled to weight appear on opposite sides. On the whole, however, the balance of opinion seems to be against their continuance. The subjoined letter is entirely of another character, and enters on the discussion of a most important subject, which we have long wished to introduce to our readers. It is well worth serious attention.]

CATHOLIC POPULAR EDUCATION.

To the Editor of the Rambler.

SIR,—As the subject of the education of the labouring classes gives rise to a great number of different opinions, and is viewed amongst ourselves in extremely varying lights, some anticipating very serious evils, and others expecting from it the coming of a new and bright era, possibly even of the millennium, it cannot but be inferred that the ideas respecting education, on which these very conflicting judgments, with all their intermediate degrees, are based, must be far from clear. The experience of the generality of discussions, often warmly maintained by persons of different sentiments on this subject, certainly shews that seldom if ever does any result ensue. The disputants part, each the more confirmed in their own notions, and more than ever convinced of the error of their opponents. Now, this circumstance alone is quite sufficient to indicate that the subject of education is one upon which we Catholics feel strongly, but, as yet, have thought and reasoned very little.

Yet of all the classes in the community we are by far the most bound to reason, to sift, and, if I may use the word, to *profound* the whole question. We ought to know most clearly *what* we are doing, and *why* we are doing it; we ought to understand what precise and definite ends we propose to attain; and whether the means we are employing are really suited to attain the end or ends which we propose. In short, when we speak of education, we ought to know exactly how much we mean by education, and how much we do not mean. I. Whether, for instance, education means merely the time spent, and the knowledge acquired in a school, and under a schoolmaster; or whether it means also the habits of vice or virtue acquired during this time in the school. II. Whether education is limited to the school and schoolmaster; or whether it also admits the teaching and influence of the parents at home, and of the society of other children and people. III. Whether education stops when the school-process ends; or whether it goes on afterwards in the factory or the workshop.

Yet, in much that has been written, and in all that is disputed, the fact is, that the term "*education*" has been and is, used without any settlement beforehand of how much or how little it is understood to mean; and hence arise the endless cross purposes of those who make it the subject of the discussions to which I have referred. Those who

dispute do not determine beforehand what they mean by "education;" possibly in some instances they may not even have thought!

With your permission I intend to propose a series of questions relating to the subject of education; and, if I venture to answer them, I particularly desire to be understood to speak under the correction of any one who will be charitable enough to give his time and his thoughts sufficiently to the questions to be proposed, to enable him to set me right, where he may judge me to have gone wrong. What we Catholics most of all want, in all the practical measures which we undertake, is completely *to understand* what we propose to do; and then to set ourselves to execute our task as workmen who do understand what they are going to do. David, before his death, gave two pieces of advice to his son Solomon, to act like a man, and to understand beforehand all that he did: *Esto vir fortis, et ut intelligas universa quæ facis*. Now the possession of the desired understanding of this question of education, I certainly do not claim. I shall be completely rewarded if what I say may lead to our obtaining it from some other quarter.

QUERY I. The inspection of Catholic Schools by an Inspector, who visits them in the name of Her Majesty's Government, and makes almost daily reports of all that he observes to the Lords of the Committee of Council, a general summary of which is printed and published at the end of one or more years. Is this a desirable thing, or is it not?

This is a controverted question. Some represent it as possessing great advantages, and express their continual surprise that the Brothers of Christian Doctrine have hitherto been so little alive to their own interests, as not to discern these advantages, and to have uniformly declined to avail themselves of the visits of the Inspector. Others think that in so doing they shew their great good sense and wisdom.

Whether it be desirable or not, I think it is almost bootless to inquire; for the reason that, whether it be so or not, we cannot help ourselves. We are not independent of the aid which the public funds supply; we have a just right to our share with others; and the condition of admitting an inspector is by no means a point on which we have been singled out for any special or peculiar oppression. On the contrary, there is something to be said in behalf of the condition. The Government distribute the public money for effecting a purpose admitted to be beneficial; and as guardians of a public trust, they can say with justice, We are entitled to be satisfied, by an Inspector whom we shall send, that you who receive our money really employ it upon the objects for which you have both asked and have received it; and it is your duty to admit our Inspector, and to give him every means of making a full and fair report.

So far there is nothing that seems open to exception. The Inspector arrives at the time announced at a given school, finds the children in somewhat of holiday attire, and in a state of expectancy; examines the different classes, either passes a compliment or two upon the state of proficiency in geography, summing, and all the numerous acquirements of the children, or looks grave, as the case may be; he gives some useful hints to the schoolmistress, casts an eye round the room, inspects the desks and inkstands, walks round the playground with the priest, with whom he afterwards dines, and in the evening sends up his official report to "My Lords." In this report, if he has been satisfied, he says, "My Lords, it becomes my pleasing task to communicate the interesting intelligence, *annuntio vobis gaudium magnum*, that in the school — which I have inspected to-day, I have found several little girls who have manifested a most consoling thirst for the acquisition of know-

ledge, and an extremely keen capacity of adding to the already large stock which they have acquired ; and further, that I also met with two little boys under eight years of age, rejoicing in the names of Bill Jones and Jacob Smith, who could satisfactorily explain the rainbow ; not to mention others who exhibited the greatest intelligence. I can assure your lordships that the cause of popular education is, on the whole, making most satisfactory progress in this locality ; such, in fact, as cannot fail to cause your lordships the most rapturous delight." The report duly arrives, is opened and spread out by the Secretary, and obtains a glance from the eye of one of my lords, who is thereupon immediately raised into the air in an ecstasy. It is then filed in due course, and consigned to its official rest on a shelf.

Here the inspection terminates, as far as it immediately affects the particular school. The priest, the master or mistress, the pupil-teachers are at liberty to attend to as many or to as few of the suggestions and recommendations made by the Inspector as they please, and to be as much affected by or as indifferent as they choose to the folio report which will go up to my lords, by the same or the following night's post, of all that has been seen and heard.

Inspection, however, as it affects Catholic education generally, does not quite end here. It is not merely that we admit a person amongst us taking notes ; but "*faith he'll prent 'em.*" There appears in print either an annual, biennial, or triennial report addressed by the Inspector to my lords, by which, through the summary of Catholic proceedings in the matter of education therein set forth, the Catholic body is supposed to be summoned before the tribunal of public opinion to take its trial. In the first report, individual schools with their masters and mistresses were subjected to this ordeal ; and sentence was pronounced upon them according to their merits or demerits ; in the last report, chiefly generalities respecting us have been laid before my lords.

I put the question, then, What is the value of this report to us ? It is plain that my lords regard the report, addressed as it is to them by their own Inspector, printed, published, and circulated at their direction, as their own instrument for rendering us in their way amenable to public opinion, since we do not in any way fall under their jurisdiction. Now how are we affected by it ? The answer still appears to me the same as before, *i. e.* "*as much or as little as we think proper.*" It is not addressed to us, but to my lords ; let my lords, then, ponder over and profit by it as much as ever they please. It is for them, and addressed to them, and proceeds from their own functionary ; clearly, then, they are the persons to study it, and to imbibe all that it contains. As for ourselves, if we can hope to find any thing useful in it, it is considerate in the extreme on the part of my lords to afford us the means of perusing it ; and we trust that we are sufficiently awake to our own interest to profit gratefully by the boon. But if, from whatever cause, we have no such hope, nothing compels us to pay a moment's attention to the report ; my lords being the persons whom it concerns, not ourselves.

So much for Government inspection of our schools and school proceedings ; to my lords it is no doubt, according to its intrinsic nature, a matter of all-absorbing interest ; to ourselves, it is a matter about which we may be concerned, *as much or as little as we think fit* ! A poor unfortunate teacher may certainly, by means of it, find that the incompetency of himself and his school have obtained a place in the chronicles and historical records of the nation ; but, poor man, human life is exposed to great trials by its very constitution ; he must try to console himself with this thought, and dismiss, as I must now do also, the

thought of Government inspection from his mind. It is not a thing about which we need be concerned more than we ourselves please.

QUERY II. What do we Catholics understand by *education* in the broad general meaning of the word? This is an all-important question, and requires a careful answer.

Education means *a process of drawing forth*; and in order for the process to exist, it requires to be applied to a subject that has life and faculties, which although they derive their principle of being elsewhere, depend upon this external process for the due attainment of their mature state. Such is the human body, which for a time is absolutely dependent upon external care, and always dependent upon food and clothing. Such is the human mind, which is dependent upon *external care* for the gradual attainment of all the various powers proper to itself. Its Creator sends it into the world in the first instance just as feeble as the body, which is its instrument and companion, and equally dependent upon the care of others for attaining its mature growth and the possession of its powers. This external care under which the body grows we call *nursing*, and that under which the mind grows we call *education*. In either case it is an external care applied to the drawing forth of the inherent capacities for growth, which both body and mind respectively possess, and to the supplying both with the proper food and nourishment which they respectively require.

The importance of this external care is as clear as can possibly be in either case. The infant body which is not properly and wisely nursed runs a great risk of dying, or at least of a sickly and diseased growth; the infant mind not properly trained becomes a feeble and imbecile thing, or, as in the extreme cases of children found wild in the woods, a thing which scarcely shews even the signs of human reason at all.

Hence, from the very nature of the human being, nothing can be more indisputable than the importance of the *question of the true education* of this mind, which, by the law of its being, is so dependent upon an external care. I do not wonder at the discussions to which it gives rise, or the deep feelings that are attached to it. The wonder rather is, that the discussions are not more numerous, and the feelings deeper; and be they what they may, they must always fail to be commensurate with the importance of the question at issue.

QUERY III. Has the Catholic body any principle or principles affecting the question of education which are peculiar to itself, and not held by any other body of persons whatever?

I answer, it has! Principles so absolutely peculiar to itself, that in the work of training the mind to the acquirement of its powers, it cannot amalgamate with any other society, but is bound to remain separate from them, and itself to suffice for all that the education of its own members requires, inexorably rejecting all interference whatever.

The first of these principles is, that the end for which man was created *is to learn to love God and to practise virtue*.

The acquiring of knowledge and the training of the powers of the mind, lawful and praiseworthy as it may be in its degree, that is, when pursued in conformity with the order of God's providence, which assigns to different men different degrees and kinds of mental labour, is in *no sense* the end for which man exists in this world. The law runs, "In the sweat of thy brow thou shalt eat bread." And consequently mental labour, in varying degrees according to the nature of the labour, is the law under which we live; and for the needs of this labour,

together with the duties of social life, we need the cultivation of the powers of the mind, as much as we need the nursing and care of the bodily frame.

But the end and problem of man's being is not the cultivation of the powers of his mind, as if it were possible to rest in these as an end; but it lies in the question of the future heaven or hell, where his abode is hereafter to be for all eternity; and this problem is solved either by his now learning to love God, to keep his commandments, and to practise virtue, the reward of which is heaven; or by his learning to hate God, to despise his laws, and to be indifferent about the practice of virtue, the end of which is hell.

In the course of this process of learning either to love or to hate God and his laws, which is his moral probation and the law of his being, man can of course attain to any degree of perfection in the use and command over the powers of his mind. He can become educated in the fullest sense of the word; but being educated, he can use his education as his special instrument, either of serving his God and furthering the work of redemption, or of rebelling against God and opposing his work. The man may become a Voltaire, or a Hume, or a Tom Paine, or a La Mennais, by the training of his mind, as well as a St. Augustin, a St. Thomas, or a Rosmini; just as by learning military tactics, he may become the leader of a revolution to deluge his country with blood and to overthrow society, as well as the commander of a regular force to protect and to save it.

A system, therefore, for the mere training of the powers of the mind, be it ever so perfect, is no subject of rejoicing or approbation to the Catholic judgment. Our education is more than this; rather this is but an element in our education, and a *purely subordinate one*; to think otherwise would, on our part, be too unfaithful to our Lord and Redeemer. We set his love and allegiance to his Church above the acquisition of the knowledge of his creation. Listen, ye promoters of the advancement of the human race in the attainment of knowledge, ye enlightened men of the nineteenth century, to what a Catholic has to say: *If we have a child to teach, our first care is to teach him that God is present on the altar, and is there offered up in sacrifice to obtain the blessings we need in this life and in the one to come. That the path of his salvation lies in his never deserting that altar, but in being fed with the bread of life from it throughout his life (the training of his mind to the acquisition of knowledge being a subordinate affair, as knowledge itself has no power to make him happy).* And now if you ask, What is this altar, and where? Bear with the announcement—*It is a Popish altar, and he who ministers at it is a Popish priest!*

Men of the 19th century, of enlarged minds and expansive views, have you never been tempted to say, on seeing our efforts to gain schools and education, "Well, these Catholics are not so behind the age, after all?" But do we not here completely part company with you? You see, without the Popish altar and the Popish priest, in our meaning of the word, there is no *education*. With these Catholics then, you will say, "Yes, yes, it is the old story. It is the *Priest*, the *Priest*, the *Priest*; nothing but the *Priest*!" You are profoundly right; in the sense you mean, it is so.

Would to God that we ourselves as fully understood this great truth. Would to God that we were free from the danger of being blinded by the popular delusion of our own day, that the problem of human life, its happiness for this life and the life to come (if there is such a thing, that is, as some, of course not Catholics, will say, as the life to come), is

to be solved by the acquisition of knowledge and by the labour of the schoolmaster.

When a *popular delusion* is widely spread, is acted upon, and lives in the minds of numerous committees and boards of guardians, and even contributes to the joys of my lords of the Committee of Council; when it expresses itself in ovations in the public prints, and arrogates to itself victory over crime, the diffusion of light, the dispelling of darkness; when it claims to be that particular remedy and satisfaction, which the stimulated and restless mind of the discontented and suffering mechanic of our large towns feels that it needs, and in a word, to be the golden key to the great problem of human life; is there no danger, that here and there among ourselves, there are those who may for a time be carried away with the delusion, and forget what our faith writes on the wall with a visible hand, *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve?* "The utility of knowledge," remarks M. de Tocqueville (*American Democracy*, vol. iii. p. 75), one of the keenest of recent observers of the popular current of thought, "is discovering itself to the mass of men with a clearness peculiar even in their own eyes. Those who do not taste its charms experience its effects, and make some efforts to obtain it." This is the popular current, this is the march of the human mind towards the idol of our day; this is the golden image which the 19th century Nebuchadnezzar has set up, and blows with his sackbut, psaltry, and dulcimer, and all kinds of music, to announce to men that they are to fall down and worship—to worship, that is, *knowledge*, knowledge of geometry, historical, genealogical, physical, and animal geography, chemistry, mineralogy, meteorology, astronomy, &c. &c. *Knowledge* is the golden image of the 19th century. And before knowledge, it is confidently reported, that the demon of Popish priestcraft will be scared to an effectual flight, and be driven to take refuge with his dear brother and associate, Asmodeus, in the upper parts of Egypt.

Are we wholly invulnerable by this wide-spread delusion? Is it no demand upon the faith and moral courage of a Catholic, to avow in the face of day the supremacy of the altar, and of the love of the God, who, by an unspeakable mystery, dwells there, over the people's idol, knowledge of the visible creation! expansion of the mind! enlightenment!

It is surely a demand upon our faith. But where in this world shall we escape from demands upon our faith? Never while we are in it can we hope for this. The worst evil that can befall a Catholic is to be ashamed of the principles of his faith. Our principle in education is that of the Apostle, *supereminentem scientiæ Jesu Christi charitatem*; the love of Jesus Christ, which surpasses all knowledge.

QUERY IV. Is the *mental training* that is suited for the condition of a labouring man, in a Catholic's judgment, essentially or not essentially different from that which is suited to a rich man?

I think I may answer the question by saying, that I see no reason why the judgment of a Catholic on this point should materially differ from that of any other man of good common sense. A Catholic's answer on this point may safely proceed from a principle which he may justly hold in common with other men of sense, and which few will venture to dispute. The mind and its powers are wanted for the labours and needs of social life; now these are extremely various, consequently the training preparatory to them must vary in the same proportion. A man who wants to be a prize-fighter subjects his body to an entirely different discipline from that of the man who is learning to dance a polka; and he who wishes to be able to ride a steeple chase, goes to a

different school from that chosen by the man whose aspirations are only to figure on horseback by a lady's side in Hyde-park. So precisely with the powers of the mind. The lawyer is trained to legal knowledge, the physician to that of medicine and anatomy, the priest to theology and the Scriptures; the artist to his art, and the artisan to his trade. And Cobbett, who, if any writer can be said to represent English common sense, passed his judgment by saying, that "the shoemaker who knew how to make a good pair of shoes was a better-educated man than the parson who did not know what the doctrine of the Establishment was." Goethe, in the collection of his sayings at the end of the quarto edition of his works, commends the opinion that was current in Greece, that the inhabitants of the island of Ægina understood education better than all the other Greeks on the ground, because their island being barren and unproductive, they sought to make all their population clever boatmen, and thus gained a good livelihood by fishing. The superiority of their ideas then consisted in this, that with them education was the directing the powers of the mind *to an end*. I am not, of course, supposing that the Greeks meant by this that they considered "catching fish" abstractedly the highest aim to which the powers of the mind could be directed, any more than that we now mean, when we praise the practical genius of the English people, that the production of calico and machinery is abstractedly the highest aim of the human intellect. But the Greeks meant, that education was best understood where it was best directed to a definite end, it being presumed that the people themselves were the best judges of the end which they sought to obtain.

It is from this principle, viz. that true *education* means the training of the powers of the mind to a particular end, that the answer to our question must proceed.

The labouring man wants the powers of his mind for his work, whatever it may be, by which he supports himself, his wife and children, for his rest and recreation by his fire-side in the midst of his family, and for learning the law of his God; for more than this he does not want his mind, for this is his life; a life poor in this world, without honour, and not uncommonly despised; but if he be religious, rich in faith, and in the hopes of the life that is to come. "The wisdom of a scribe," says a writer who had studied human nature more than it is now studied, "cometh by his time of leisure, and he that is less in action shall receive wisdom. With what wisdom shall he be furnished that holdeth the plough, and that glorieth in the goad, that driveth the oxen therewith, and his whole talk is about bullocks? He shall give his mind to turn up furrows, and his care *is to give the kine fodder*." The same writer then draws a picture of the carver, of the blacksmith, and the potter, and their characteristics are, that they all give their mind to their work. "The carver gives his mind to the resemblance of the image, and by his watching he shall finish his work. The blacksmith setteth his mind to finish his work, and his watching is to polish it to perfection. The potter gives his mind to finish the glazing, and his watching to make clean the furnace. All these trust to their own hands, and every one is wise in his own art. Yet, these are not the men to sit in the judge's seat, nor are they to declare discipline and judgment, or to be found where parables are spoken. But without these is not the city built; they strengthen the state of the world; they make their prayer, engaged in the work of their craft. In this they apply their soul, and search in the law of the Most High." (Ecclus. xxxviii.)

The rich man, on the contrary, wants the powers of his mind for very different purposes. He wants them for travelling, for society, for

amusements, for *killing* his time as it is called, for managing, or rather interfering with the management of his estate, and the like. The two kinds of life have very little in common, and consequently, admitting the principle that education is the training the powers of the mind for a particular end, namely, the labour or the needs of after-life, it follows that the education which is good for the labouring man is quite a different thing from the education required by the rich man.

QUERY V. Is education, as it is conducted in our Catholic schools, so directed as best to consult for the true interests and wants of the labouring classes?

Upon this point I shall speak with perfect frankness, and say that, with the very best, nay most unexceptionable intentions on the part of those who promote and direct it, I do not think that it does wisely consult for the real wants and needs of the labouring classes: and I assign as my reason, that it falls down too much before the popular idol, *mere knowledge*, really to consult for their wants. There is too much of *mere knowledge worship* in it; too much of knowledge not directed to any end, even remotely affecting the life of the labouring man.

To teach the ignorant is of course a work of mercy:—who doubts or disputes this? So also is it a work of mercy to clothe the naked; yet even in this latter there is a way of going to work that may turn what was intended for a kindness into an injury. There is in the history of Sandford and Merton, a part which describes the polite Master Merton as having given a portion of his dress that was a little too highly decorated to be quite becoming to the poor sweep, upon whom, however, he bestowed it with the best intentions. The poor sweep, in this unusual and gaudy attire, was soon afterwards knocked down by his companions, rolled in the mud, and, if my memory does not fail me, he shortly afterwards returned to his benefactor and gave him back his unsuitable gift, telling him of his pitiful case, and that all the good that he had gained from it had been that it had brought him in for a beating and a being rolled in the mud. We should be prepared to contemplate the possibility of something quite similar happening in the instruction intended to benefit the children of the poor. To force the acquirement of mere knowledge upon them, that has no reference to their state or prospects in life, is not really a work of mercy to them, but simply on a par with the giving the embroidered piece of dress to the poor sweep. To what good practical purpose can it be to load the memory of the poor little daughter of a cottager with the longitude and latitude of towns in China, which in no way concern its life? I picture to myself an affectionate, nice, rosy-cheeked cottager's daughter, as we often see such children, with the clear complexion, artless sweetness, the bright eye and cheerful countenance that are found in such numbers in our country villages. This little child's future life will be a simple, innocent, domestic life. Now what is she learning at school in the way of preparation? She is learning there the longitude and latitude of places she will never see, the contents of mines that she will never visit, the length and width of rivers she will never cross, the last census of towns she will never come near, descriptions of birds and beasts she will never behold, except she should happen to be taken to the British Museum, and should there spy out a specimen or two stuffed, and the habits of fishes and animals that will never come in her way. This is the sort of knowledge which, without quite excluding what heretofore has been deemed useful, viz. reading, summing, writing, grammar, &c., she is learning; and the thing to observe is, that it is *this very knowledge*

which is supposed to be the pre-eminent and distinctive *merit* of the system of education under which she is being taught. What is the principle or foundation of this system of teaching such kind of knowledge, and making so great a point of it? It is the popular axiom of the day, viz. that it is *knowledge* which *expands the mind*, and that to have the *mind well expanded* in education is the grand thing.

Now to dismiss for a moment the question of the use of such knowledge to the child of a labouring man, and even to admit, for argument's sake, the principle that *expansion* of the mind is the *grand thing* in education, I ask, Does this sort of knowledge cause this *expansion* of the mind, which you aim after? Are you so completely sure of your result? Observe, the knowledge in question is the knowledge of isolated facts and disconnected pieces of information. Its expansive virtue cannot, then, be restricted to one set of such facts more than to another; and therefore any such person who has the knowledge of a sufficient number of such facts must be judged to possess a well-expanded mind. Now on this shewing, who shall compete, in point of expansion of mind, with a London cabman? Here you have a man who knows the names of all the streets in London and its environs, most of the principal shops, all the tea-gardens and public-houses, and their absolutely exact distances from every stand where he posts himself,—who knows all the different trades and professions by their dress and manners as they walk in the streets. Who shall compete with this man in the knowledge of facts, if this be *expansion* of mind?

But even admitting it to be proved that this knowledge both expands the mind and is found by experience to be really suited to the needs of a labouring man's life, I proceed to ask, Is it likely to be retained in the memory for any length of time after the pupil is withdrawn from the school, and goes to his or her way of life, whatever it may be? For knowledge forgotten simply ceases to be, and has no existence, and therefore cannot be of any use. Prior to an experience which I do not possess, it would be hazardous to pronounce; but as shewing what a person of common sense expected to happen in the case of her own daughters who were training as pupil-teachers, I may mention that on a pastoral visit to her, I asked the question—"Come, now, Mrs.—, tell me the honest truth; do you really think that all the things your daughters are learning for this examination will be of any actual use to them?" She replied, "Well, sir, it cannot do them any great *harm!* for they will forget it all again in six months; and you know, sir, the Government now gives money for it, and it is always convenient to have money."

But, again, is there no danger of this kind of knowledge having, besides its supposed beneficial effects in the expansion of the mind, also its counterpart of evil, which has not been bargained for, in breeding conceit and discontent with a humble condition in life, petty self-sufficiency, insubordination at home, and disdain of all homely occupations and of domestic duties? There are numbers of sensible persons who say confidently, that the result of our present schools will be, that there will be no more good maid-servants, who will stay in their places, and merit the confidence of their mistresses. Now, this is a testimony to the practical working of our schools, which comes with a weight that cannot be set aside; I shall not say that I know it from experience to be just, but I do say that, prior to any experience whatever of the actual results, it is what I should myself always consider ought to be expected as the natural fruit of the system pursued. One swallow, of course, does not make a summer; and the solitary instance, therefore, that did fall under my

observation, by itself proves nothing. It was, however, precisely of the kind I should myself always expect. The child in question had been a monitress in a large school for some years, with great applause for proficiency in numerous different branches of knowledge, and now, for the first time, was required by her mistress to mend her own stockings. Oh, the horror and disdain! oh, the sense of indignity! A being gifted with such knowledge as hers made to mend stockings! forbid it, education and science! But still, in spite of either education or science, and amid floods of tears, the stockings were mended in the presence of the mistress, and the most really useful lesson in the education of that child was there and then taught.

On the whole, then, as regards the really beneficent character of the system of teaching rather largely pursued in our existing schools, especially in Ireland, a practical judgment may be approximately formed, by making choice between the conflicting first principles on which the various ideas that are in vogue rest for their basis.

If a person takes for his first principles, the popular axiom of *knowledge worship*, that the problem of human life is solved by the acquisition of knowledge, that expansion of the mind is the end of life, and that the possession of knowledge is this expansion of the mind; then, of course, the more competent the schoolmaster is to impart knowledge, the more vigorously he drives his pupils forward, and the faster they move on under his driving, to the acquisition of the knowledge that he teaches, the more completely is the *end* of their life in the way of being attained; and the greater, of course, is the satisfaction of the person who holds this principle; for he can reflect with continual joy, that if the children brought up in this way in the school do but carry into after life the habits begun to be formed of amassing knowledge, which it is to be hoped that in the majority of cases they will, and if they faithfully employ every spare half hour they can dispose of in some kind of investigation, that then the amount of knowledge they will thus acquire before they die will be something quite enormous. How consoling a thought for such persons!

The advantage to the person holding this principle, moreover, is extremely evident, for it disposes of every question that can be raised against it.

Does an opponent ask, What can be the use of this knowledge to the labouring man? He replies, What! don't you know that it expands the mind?

But how do you know that it expands the mind? It is quite certain that it does!

But then it will be forgotten when the boy or girl leaves the school. No, they will acquire such an appetite for knowledge, that they will always be more and more expanding their minds by the acquisition of fresh knowledge.

But it will make them conceited, discontented with home, dissatisfied, insubordinate and contemptuous to their parents, whom they will look down upon as ignorant; it will make them jealous of each other's acquirements. All this, he will say, does not signify, they will have expanded minds, and that is the great thing!

But if a person sets out from totally opposite first principles, first principles of revealed religion and religious common sense, that the problem of human life is solved *by the love of God, and of his moral law*, not by the acquisition of knowledge; if he adopts the principle of the Greek nation as to the education of the mental faculties, which is also that of religious common sense, that these faculties being needed

for the exigencies of actual life in this world, are then alone wisely trained when their training is directed towards the actual needs of the child's future life, which it is incumbent upon those concerned to foresee and to prepare for as far as may be;—then, instead of applauding the efforts made to spread *this knowledge*, which it is the other man's delight to contemplate being spread, he distinctly and unhesitatingly condemns it, and this on two grounds: 1st, as making that an end which is not an end, and which cannot consistently with revelation be rested on as an end; 2d, as a waste or a fooling away of the powers of the mind upon the acquisition of knowledge not at all concerning the actual life, personal or social, either of the child or the future grown-up man or woman; a labour which, as regards the person performing it, is on a par with that of a man who is *not* going to build a house, wheeling bricks and mortar to a particular place which are *never* to be used. Indirectly he may benefit by the exercise and the fresh air; but the bricks and the mortar, as he wheels them, are of no use, and his labour in wheeling them *there* has also no direct use whatever. It is precisely the same with irrelevant knowledge,—it is simply valueless to its possessor, as a thing in his possession; the labour of acquiring it may or may not have been somewhat beneficial as an exercise, but the thing acquired has no use. And as regards those who promote its diffusion, their part in the matter is on a par with the wisdom and judgment that Master Merton shewed, when, as the story runs, he gave his own smart piece of dress to the sweep. It did the sweep no good, except that it enabled him to acquire the merit of bearing to be knocked down and rolled in the mud, that is, if he did bear it patiently,—a benefit not directly intended or contemplated.

QUERY VI. What are the precise benefits which a Catholic is justified in expecting from the labours and functions of the schoolmaster?

Prior to experience there cannot, in the nature of things, be any antecedent axiom as to the good fruits of the schoolmaster's labours. Because as the foolish and ignorant nurse may kill the child by her injudicious care, so the foolish and misdirected schoolmaster may completely frustrate and baulk the benefits of education. It is a question which can alone be answered by the result. "A wise woman," says the proverb, "buildeth up her house; but the foolish woman pulleth it down with her own hands." All must admit that the schoolmaster *per se* exercises functions necessary to the welfare of society; but whether the particular schoolmaster's labours produce good result, depends, first, on the principles upon which he proceeds, and, secondly, upon his own wisdom or incompetency in carrying them out. As a corrupt tree cannot produce good fruit, so, in the work of education, there is nothing so fatally baneful, so deeply to be dreaded, as *false first principles* for the basis of the *working system*. Good fruit cannot come forth from them, but only in defiance of them; a case which is quite possible.

QUERY VII. What, then, is the chief thing to be attended to in the direction of the efforts that are being made for the extension of Catholic schools and schoolmasters?

Your space would not permit all the questions that might be put and answered; this question therefore shall for the present be the last; not that the subject so much as the room that can be conceded to it begins to be exhausted. It admits of an answer about which there can be but little dispute. The point to be attended to, in the first place, is this, to examine and settle the question of *first principles*; for such as are these, such inevitably must be the system, in practice, that is based and built

up upon them. The question of first principles precedes every possible question of detail that can be raised; for they are either solved by, or are completely subordinate to them.

As I have had occasion to say before, Catholic first principles in education are our distinct and peculiar inheritance and monopoly, which we neither do share, nor could share if we would, with any other society on earth. Because, whatever agreement we may find in our theoretical doctrines with those of others, however we may discover that this or that truth or principle is also a recognised part of another society's views, still, when it comes to practice and real life, *our extreme first principle*, which is *ours*, and which we cannot without apostacy deny or disown, that attachment to the Popish altar and the sacrifice offered upon it by the Popish priest, is the condition under which alone a man can be pleasing to God in his acquiring knowledge, or can find the knowledge he acquires really beneficial to himself—forces us at this point to part company, in the work of education, with all others, and all others to part company with us.

Incidentally, in the course of the answers made to the queries here proposed, what I consider to be our true principles appear; but still, I have abstained from stating them dogmatically; and I now purposely abstain from drawing up a summary of them, or from presuming to digest them into a code. I began by professing to speak under correction, and with the renewal of this profession I must for the present conclude, trusting that to some abler hand will fall the task of sifting and examining, and of shewing to us what our principles really are, and how we ought to go to work to carry them out in practice. The infinite importance of the interests at stake all admit.

I remain, your obedient servant,
SACERDOS.

DEVOTIONS TO THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.

To the Editor of the Rambler.

SIR,—One or two circumstances which have come under my own observation may be interesting in connexion with the deeply interesting articles in the *Rambler*, on Devotions to the Blessed Sacrament.

First, as regards the laity receiving at the altar (see p. 108). At Marseilles, *men* are invariably communicated within the sanctuary, kneeling on the top step of the predella; the *women* are afterwards communicated in the usual manner at the rails. Talking on the subject with one of the Conceptionist Fathers, he told me that the custom had obtained since the first revolution, and though not approved of by the clergy, had never since been authoritatively forbidden. I do not know whether the same custom exists elsewhere. In Spain, the royal family communicate within the sanctuary, where likewise they kneel during Mass, and are permitted to kiss the corporal before it is replaced into the burse after the ablutions.

Again, as to using the Blessed Sacrament to extinguish conflagrations, some of your readers may have observed in the Musée at Louvain a painting representing the cessation of a fire in that town, on the Blessed Sacrament being exposed before it. In this instance, I think It is exposed in a monstrance; but whether the procession happened to be passing, or whether It was taken there for the purpose of allaying the fire, I do not know.—Your obedient servant,
Y.

Ecclesiastical Register.

THE PRIMATE OF ALL IRELAND ON A NATIONAL MODEL SCHOOL FOR DROGHEDA.

LETTER OF MR. BOYLAN (ALDERMAN) TO THE PRIMATE, ON THE IN-
STITUTION OF A MODEL SCHOOL IN DROGHEDA.

August 15, 1851.

MY LORD,—A movement has been made in this town for the purpose of getting the inhabitants to petition the Commissioners of National Education to establish one of their Model-schools amongst us. The matter was lately brought before the corporation, and a discussion arose, in which the question of mixed education was introduced. It was argued that your Grace was favourable to the model-schools and the mixed system, because you patronise the National Schools in this diocese. Some persons appear to justify their zeal for the system by your Grace's approval of it. The matter, my Lord, appears to me and to other Catholics to be one of great importance, as on it may depend the fate of the rising Catholic generation in this town. We therefore look to you, my Lord, as our chief pastor, for counsel in a matter of so much moment, and so closely connected with our spiritual interests, in order that we may more easily determine what course we ought to take in regard to the movement now set on foot.

I send your Grace a report of our proceedings at the corporation, in order that you may more readily understand our position. I have the honour to remain, my Lord, your Grace's most obedient humble servant,
PATRICK BOYLAN, Alderman.

ANSWER OF THE PRIMATE.

Fair-street, Drogheda, 17th August, 1851.

MY DEAR MR. BOYLAN,—I feel great pleasure in answering the questions concerning education, on which you and some other respected Catholic members of the corporation of this town have consulted me. Education is the great question of the present day, and the religion of the rising generation in Ireland, and every other country, must depend, in a great degree, on the character that will be impressed upon it. It may be made the source of great good or of great evil. It was, therefore, most consoling to me to observe that you and your worthy colleagues were determined to proceed with caution and deliberation, and a due respect to the rights and interests of religion, in discussing the important matter that had come before you. Too much vigilance cannot be employed in such an affair, for under a bad system of education, the souls of those little ones that have been redeemed by the precious blood of Jesus Christ may be exposed to danger, and impressions made on them that can scarcely ever afterwards be effaced.

Before I enter into the subject of your communication, allow me to assure you that I do not yield to any one in a sincere desire to see our people well instructed. You, and every true Catholic, feel as I do, and our feelings are quite in accordance with the spirit of the Catholic Church. She has been the instructress and civiliser of all the nations of the earth; every noble and useful institution that we possess has originated with her; and to her are due the preservation of the arts and sciences in ages of darkness, and their revival and diffusion at a later

period. The man who accuses the Catholic Church of promoting or patronising ignorance, or of being hostile to the improvement of the mind, either does not know her history, or wilfully misrepresents it.

There is, indeed, a sort of knowledge not encouraged by our Church, a knowledge without religion; which, as the Apostle St. Paul says, puffeth up; and is described by St. James as earthly, sensual, devilish. The effects of knowledge of this kind can be easily traced in the history of Europe during the last eighty years. Its fruits have been sedition, rebellion, immorality, impiety; or, at least, an indifference to every sort of religion. Within the last twenty years the occupier of the throne in France and his ministers became its patronisers in their University system; and, though that system was altogether under their control, yet they fell victims to the wicked spirit which their favoured godless education called into existence and nurtured. ‘*Et nunc reges intelligite, erudimini qui judicatis terram.*’ (Ps. ii.)

To make these observations more intelligible, I need scarcely add that we, as Catholics, cannot sanction or recommend any system of education that is opposed to our faith, or dangerous to it. We believe that there is but one true Faith, without which it is impossible to please God; one true Church, out of which there is no salvation. Any teaching that is hostile to these doctrines, or tends to weaken them in the minds of youth, we must consider as unsuited for Catholics, and worthy of our reprobation.

Without making any further general remarks, I shall now state that it is my conviction that mixed education, in its general tendency, is dangerous to Catholic Faith, and well calculated to sow the seeds of indifferetism in the tender mind; and that its effects, where it has been tried, have been found pernicious. Such effects may not be immediate; they may not be verified in every individual case; but still, if the system work slowly, like some poisons, it produces its fruits surely and effectually.

The Protestants of this country seem to admit and to act on those principles. The education they give to their children is purely Protestant; their university and their colleges are altogether under Protestant control. They never send a child to any Catholic college. Would to God that Catholics were as cautious as their Protestant countrymen! The contrast in their conduct is rendered more remarkable when we reflect upon their religious tenets. Protestants do not attach much importance to any particular doctrines; they may vary their opinions every week or every month; they may believe a little more or a little less, still remaining good Protestants. The greatest dignitaries in their Church hold contradictory opinions upon the leading truths of Christianity, even upon the divinity of Jesus Christ; and it has been lately decided by their highest authority in spiritual matters—the Privy Council—that a man may hold or deny regeneration in baptism without ceasing to be an orthodox member of their communion. Whilst their opinions are so unsettled, and they are tossed about by every wind of doctrine, is it not strange that Protestants should be so anxious to impress certain notions on the minds of their children, and to make education anti-Catholic? Now, what is the doctrine of Catholics? We believe that if any one wilfully denies, or even calls into doubt, one single article of our faith, he ceases to be a member of the true Church, and must be regarded as out of the way of salvation. With St. Paul we say, ‘That if an angel from heaven preached to you a gospel besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema’ (Gal. i. 8). Yet it is a melancholy fact, that many Catholics send their children to schools where

our religion is impugned, and which present many awful instances of apostacy. When Catholic children are admitted to such schools, it is the fashion to call them mixed schools, and to speak of the advantages of a mixed education. The truth is that there is no mixture of Catholicity in them. It may happen that a Catholic youth will pass unscathed through such an ordeal, but even then the parent that thrusts his child into the furnace of danger must incur an awful responsibility in the sight of God.

It appears that in the discussion on education, to which you have kindly called my attention, it has been argued that I must be favourable to mixed education, because I approve of the National Schools in this diocese.

The explanation of this apparent contradiction is quite easy. In common with the other Bishops of Ireland, I abstain from either approving or condemning the National Schools in general. Some of these schools work practically well, and whilst visiting this diocese, I was happy to find the children who frequent them well instructed in their religion. But these are not mixed schools; the managers, the teachers, the children, are, I may say, all Catholics; the spirit of the schools is Catholic. There are two such schools in this town. A great deal might be said about the system on which such schools are conducted; but I do not intend, nor is it necessary, to touch on that matter now. There are other National Schools, in which the managers, masters, and children, are Protestants or Presbyterians, and which are not frequented by Catholic children. It is not in my sphere to interfere with such schools; but I may say that as Protestants are taxed for the support of the National system, it is fair that they should participate in any benefits it confers in a way proportionate to the number of their poor children. But there is a third class of National Schools under the control of proselytising parsons, or agents of bigoted enemies of our faith, in which, though the masters are Protestant, and the teaching and spirit Protestant, yet Catholic children, by promises or threats, are induced to attend. Such schools I consider most dangerous. There is no protection in them for the faith of Catholic children. The parents, indeed, may object to the teaching of Protestant doctrines, and make their representations to the board. But this is in reality no protection, when the parents are dependent on the patrons or managers of the school. It would be necessary to say a great deal about this branch of the National system. I shall for the present limit myself to observe that it is most unjust to tax a Catholic population for the support of schools of this kind, that have been, or may be, made an engine for undermining their faith. It is to be regretted that the original rules of the National Board have been modified in a manner to favour such schools that may be made nurseries of proselytism.

It will not be necessary for me to make many observations about the Model-school, which has been the principal occasion of the correspondence. The object of such establishments appears to be the development of mixed education. Protestant, Presbyterian, and Catholic teachers are to be united in them, and children of every denomination are invited to attend them, and thus a mixture is compounded that is any thing rather than Catholic. Neither the Catholic clergy nor any other Catholic body has any control over the appointment or removal of masters or mistresses, or over their teaching in the schools. The whole system tends to inspire children with the absurd idea that all religions are equally good; and is thus hostile to truth, which is one and exclusive in its nature. The system is also directed to throw the edu-

cation of a Catholic population into the hands of a Protestant government, or at least of a commission appointed by the Protestant ministers of the day. Ought Catholics, or can they, conscientiously take an active part in establishing such schools?

But it will be said that we are living in times of great liberality, and that no teacher would interfere with the religious doctrines of his pupils. This assertion is made every day, and is always on the lips of those Catholics who send their children to anti-Catholic or dangerous schools. But is it borne out by experience? On the contrary, we have the clearest evidence that men who profess themselves liberal are oftentimes most hostile to our religion, and make every exertion to injure it. Who ever enjoyed a higher character for liberality than our prime minister? Yet in his Durham correspondence he treats our practices as the mummeries of superstition, and proclaims that our Church confines the mind and enslaves the intellect. The dignitaries of the Established Church are also very liberal and enlightened men; but were they not the loudest in their demand for penal enactments against Catholics? I believe that even in this town they got up a petition against us.

Now, when we see that the most liberal of prime ministers, and the highest as well as the lowest dignitaries of the Church as by law established, do not hesitate to display great bigotry when we are concerned, are we to be assured, or are we to believe, that Protestant teachers are quite exempt from the spirit that animates their superiors? Are we over-prudent if we do not wish to commit the instruction of Catholic children to masters who, for any guarantee given to us, may be, if not open and candid, occult and insidious enemies of our faith? But even in the case that the teachers in question are altogether free from bigotry, as it sometimes happens, still may they not produce a bad effect on Catholic Faith without knowing or intending it? It is generally stated that in Trinity College there is no interference with the religious principles of the Catholics who frequent it. But the example of those in office, the sneers of companions, the spirit of the place, the atmosphere itself produce their effect; and many young men either become open apostates from the faith of their fathers, or at least lose the spirit of their religion, and abandon its practices and observances. The same effects will probably be produced in due time in our model-schools, when mixed education will be fully developed in them.

You are well aware, my dear Mr. Boylan, that our faith is to be prized above every treasure this world can afford. Our forefathers suffered the confiscation of their property, and even laid down their lives rather than renounce it. Shall we be so degenerate as to expose this precious gift of heaven, without which it is impossible to please God, to imminent danger for some paltry temporal consideration?

Be so good as to communicate my sentiments on this subject to the other Catholic gentlemen who consulted me. Assure them that I feel it my duty to aid them by my counsel on every question connected with their eternal salvation, and the preservation of the faith of our Catholic children. Having been charged by God, through the Apostolic See, with the care of all the faithful in this diocese, like the Apostle I must say, that to all I am a debtor.—Believe me to be, with sincerest esteem and best wishes, your devoted servant,

✠ PAUL CULLEN, Archbishop,
Primate of all Ireland.

PATRICK BOYLAN, ESQ. ALD., &c.

NOTE.—Not having time to explain the several variations intro-